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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In attempts to describe and reduce the Chinese language into comprehensible grammars, linguists have experimented with various different approaches and views of the language. Grammars such as Li and Thompson (1981), Quirk and Greenbaum (1973), Tsao (1990) are based on a particular form of the language, either spoken or written. Y.R. Chao (1968), based his grammar on the spoken language and the intuition of native speakers of Chinese. Seldom do linguists describe the language from both a spoken and written perspective, or attempt to describe the differences between these two modes of the language. When presenting descriptions of Chinese linguists most often provide grammars that are neither specific to the spoken or the written language, nor do they attempt to account for specific differences between the two. In order to enrich one's understanding of the language it is necessary that the analyst first understands the differences between the spoken and written language, and then describe the language by analyzing both written and spoken texts. The purpose of this study is to describe some fundamental differences between spoken and written discourse in Chinese. By so doing teachers and researchers can be better equipped in their attempts to understand and describe the language. This study will include a more detailed look at the aspect system in Mandarin Chinese for the purpose of demonstrating that even with specific grammatical features such as perfective aspect marking, there are considerable differences between speech and writing. By concluding this study we will be able to better understand the differences between spoken and written discourse in Chinese and to appreciate more fully the significance of those differences.
At this point it will be helpful to analyze briefly the major focuses of linguistic inquiry to understand better the different approaches, and to understand better why I am using the approach I have decided upon in this study.

The study of modern linguistics as we know it began early in this century when the French linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1916) observed two distinct types of language which he termed *langue* and *parole*. *Langue* can be interpreted as a person’s internal knowledge of the language as reflected in the written language and *parole* as speech, or the spoken language. Saussure (1916:19) explains: "speaking is what causes language to evolve... language and speaking are independent; the former is both the instrument and the product of the latter." He then goes on to say that "Taken as a whole, speech cannot be studied, for it is not homogenous.". In other words, according to Saussure, language (i.e. written language) is concrete, homogenous, and regular, whereas speech is too irregular and unpredictable. This theory of language caused Saussure to consider *langue* as supreme and the focus of serious linguistic research. Even today the study of *langue*, or a person’s internal knowledge of a language, (oftentimes reflected in ‘grammatical’ written language), is still a priority. This emphasis has been carried down to this day and is especially apparent in the formal approach developed and popularized by Chomsky, whose theory of language was based on a person’s ability to acquire language. He makes a distinction between competence and performance, which are roughly equivalent to Saussure’s *langue/parole* distinction. Competence is defined as a person’s knowledge of his language and performance as the actual use of the language in concrete situations (Chomsky 1965). Chomsky claims that performance cannot directly reflect competence because of all the irregularities that are a part of everyday speech. In his view, the purpose of linguistic study is to provide "a system of rules that in some explicit and well-defined way assigns structural descriptions to sentences"(1965:8). This is what he calls a generative grammar.
Though Chomsky may base his theory, or supporting data on the spoken language (that is, a person's internal knowledge of the spoken language), he nevertheless states that a serious study of language cannot be based on observed language, or his notion of performance. He states: "Observed use of language or hypothesized dispositions to respond, habits, and so on, may provide evidence as to the nature of this reality, but surely cannot constitute the actual subject matter of linguistics, if this is to be a serious discipline" (1965:4). Davis (1990:4) points out that because Chomsky is mainly concerned with "the acquisition of a mentally represented rule system which enables one to become a fully competent language-user" he likens the field of sociolinguistics to collecting butterflies. One can make observations but there is nothing substantial to contribute to the understanding of language. Labov, on the other hand, considers the term sociolinguistics to be redundant because he feels that language cannot be taken from its social context. That is, language is a social phenomenon. Thus sociolinguistics is nothing more than linguistics, or the study of language. Chomsky furthermore bases his theory on the notion of an ideal speaker-listener's knowledge of language. Labov (1969:759) challenges this claim:

The construction of complete grammars for 'dialects', even one's own, is a fruitless and unrewarding task; we know enough about language in its social context to realize that the grammar of the speech community is more regular and systematic than the behavior of any one individual. Unless the individual speech pattern is studied within the overall system of the community, it will appear as a mosaic of unaccountable and sporadic variation.

The major distinction that we observe from these various viewpoints is the distinction between observed or 'captured' language, or discourse, as we shall call it, and language that is constructed through introspection by (native) linguists. The sub-field of linguistics, discourse analysis, deals with the former. The latter is that ideal language created by the ideal speaker-hearer based on his knowledge of the language.
The purpose here is not to debate which of these two approaches is better, but rather to provide the basic tenets of each so as to more fully understand the two approaches and their characteristics.

Over the years there have been a number of studies based on both the competence-based formal approach as well as other more performance-based functional approaches. Linguists have benefited from studies of language based on both of these approaches. It is not the intention here to discredit the formal approach to linguistic analysis, but rather to expand upon it by discussing the benefits of a discourse-based approach to studying a language, particularly in regard to this study. Even a discourse-based approach cannot totally dismiss the importance and value of native intuition and of using abstracted language samples to aid in explaining a particular point.

Schiffrin (1994) has pointed out that discourse analysis is one of the most vast, yet least defined field in linguistics. The concept discourse analysis, which to many is the study of observed language, is not a new phenomenon in the realm of linguistic studies. Discourse analysis, though, is a relative newcomer to the field. With a plethora of linguistic theories, the study and analysis of discourse provides an additional and refreshing approach to the study and understanding of human language.

In the realm of Chinese linguistics, there has recently been an increasing number of studies dealing with discourse, or observed language. They include: Tai (1978), Spanos (1979), Chang (1986), Chen (1986), Bourgerie (1990), Erbaugh (1990), Hickman and Liang (1990), McGinnis (1990), Miracle (1991), Li (1991), Sanders (1991) Tai and Hu (1991), and Tao (1993). These studies have provided a valuable alternative to the formal, introspective approach to analyzing language and have contributed considerably to our understanding of the Chinese language. This study is one among many in the past few years that uses discourse to analyze language.
As mentioned above, the purpose of this study is two-fold. One, to examine the differences between spoken and written narrative discourse in Mandarin Chinese, and two, to analyze specifically the relationship of the viewpoint aspect (Smith 1992) in written and spoken narratives. A number of studies in the past have examined the differences and unique features of oral and written discourse in the English language. Tannen, Chafe, and others have aptly shown many differences between these two modes, or genres of discourse. A broad study of this type has not been attempted in Chinese to the present. This study will provide a detailed analysis of the many differences between oral and written discourse in Mandarin Chinese. Features such as length, lexical and syntactic variation, discourse strategies, sequencing, and some cognitive variables will be analyzed. By analyzing both written and spoken Chinese in an authentic context we may come to understand more fully the salient characteristics of these two genres of discourse. In so doing we hope to come to a greater understanding of the Chinese language by looking at it from two different viewpoints, spoken and written. This analysis may also help researchers and language teachers to deal better with the language as a whole, particularly with regard to syntactic variation, and discourse strategies.

As linguistic aspect is a particularly troublesome feature of Chinese syntax to define and describe, it is hoped that this study will shed light on how the viewpoint aspect (primarily the perfective aspect) functions in both oral and written texts. By looking at both genres of discourse we hope to gain a different perspective and understanding of this grammatical feature. Furthermore, analyzing the viewpoint aspect in oral and written Chinese discourse will be beneficial in two regards. One, it will help in the overall understanding of the aspect system in Chinese, and two, it will provide language teachers with a more complete description of how and when aspect markers occur in context in narrative discourse.
This study will begin with an examination of the concept of discourse. In 1.1, of this chapter, we will discuss the various definitions and applications of discourse so as to understand better this broad discipline of linguistic studies. In 1.2 we will consider the various genres of discourse and the vast amount of contexts and varieties of discourse that exist. Rationale for analyzing discourse is presented in 1.3 along with a discussion of context and some pedagogical implications. 1.4 is a brief survey of the existing literature on the differences between spoken and written discourse. This will provide some fundamental understanding of the variation that exists between these two genres of discourse before we look in more detail at the case in Chinese. In the final section, 1.5, we will outline the rest of this study.

1.1 Defining Discourse

The study of discourse has evolved from the following fields: linguistics, sociology, anthropology, philosophy, and psychology. When linguists think of discourse, the following sub-fields of linguistics may come to mind: discourse analysis, conversation analysis, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics. It is true that each of these fields are related to discourse analysis in that they typically use discourse, or observed language, as the primary locus of linguistic data to isolate and analyze. Since discourse has been defined in different ways, we are obliged to define this term with its various meanings and applications.

Perhaps the most rudimentary definition of discourse is: "a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence" (Crystal, 1985:96). With this definition in mind practically all forms and types of language qualify as discourse. Crystal (1985:96) goes on to say that in general, discourse is: "a set of utterances which constitute any recognizable speech event." With this further clarification Crystal suggests that "real"
discourse lies in the realm of orally produced language. Is written language then not discourse? It is probably safe to say that when one thinks of discourse, the spoken language comes to mind first, but we obviously cannot exclude written language. According to this similar definition, discourse is the study of language beyond the confines of the traditional grammatical boundaries of the sentence. Instead of isolating a single sentence, or similar grammatical unit, the analyst looks beyond this unit to see how "speech events" occur, how they are joined together, how they are ordered, and what they mean in a larger context.

Brown and Yule (1983) provide yet another important definition of discourse by equating the study of discourse as the analysis of language in use. They further extend this by identifying the purpose for discourse analysis as the investigation of what the language is used for. Stubbs (1983) defines discourse as language that occurs naturally, that is, produced spontaneously in the sense that it is unplanned and composed in "real" time in response to immediate situational demands. He also states that discourse can also be deliberately planned, rehearsed, thought about, altered, or edited. At this point we should expand these definitions by stating that in analyzing discourse it is also important to take into account how the language is used in terms of lexicon, syntax, and phonology. According to these definitions then, discourse accounts for all forms and varieties of language except that which is created by the analyst solely for the purpose of linguistic analysis.

Schiffrin (1994) states that discourse can be defined in terms of two concepts. One, discourse is a unit of language larger than the sentence and, two, discourse is language in use. In addition to defining discourse, Schiffrin provides a detailed description of six different approaches to the study of discourse that she feels are the most important and have contributed the most to the field of discourse analysis. These six approaches are: speech act
theory, interactional sociolinguistics, ethnography of communication, pragmatics, conversation analysis, and variation analysis. By keeping these different approaches in mind we can better understand what discourse is and how it is analyzed.

Speech act theory was developed by two philosophers, John Austin (1962) and John Searle (1969). This theory is based on the belief that language is used to perform actions and focuses on how meaning and action are related to language. Interactional sociolinguistics is based in anthropology, sociology, and linguistics and their concerns with culture, society, and language. The anthropological linguist John Gumperz (1982) was instrumental in developing this theory. His views focus on how people from different cultures may share the same grammatical knowledge of a language, but have different conceptualization of what is said to the point that very different messages are produced (Schiffrin 1994). The ethnography of communication was primarily developed by Dell Hymes and focuses on communicative competence; that is, the social knowledge that governs the appropriate use of language. This was a direct challenge to Chomsky's views of language, which discounted the value of the relationship between language and society.

Pragmatics emerges from the views of Grice (1975) and is concerned with analyzing speaker intention in context. It deals with three concepts: meaning, context, and communication. Conversation analysis is related to phenomenology and ethnomethodology. The main concern with this approach is the question of social order and how language is formed by the social context. It assumes that all interaction is important and significant. The last approach is variation analysis based on the work of William Labov (1972). This approach views linguistic variation as being patterned both socially and linguistically, and that patterns can be discovered by analyzing a speech community. This theory focuses on finding formal patterns in texts (often narratives) and the analysis of how these patterns are constrained by the text (Schiffrin 1994). Regardless of the approach, all
of the above mentioned frameworks specifically deal with discourse as it has been defined, and represent the leading theories in the field of discourse analysis.

These definitions are important in that they clarify that discourse involves the analysis of language in use, or "natural" language. I define "natural" as that kind of language which is produced by native speakers in an authentic social context. This would include: conversation, speeches, articles, newspaper, and so on. Our definition would then exclude fabricated, artificial language, which is created by the analyst solely for the purpose of explaining or supporting a linguistic theory or supposed speech phenomenon.

1.2 The Genres of Discourse

The definitions discussed above firmly indicate that discourse consists of many different forms or genres. Schiffrin (1988) states that discourse includes both written and spoken modes of language and that it can be dialogic or monologic in nature. This would concur with our view of natural language as certainly consisting of both written and spoken language. Discourse can then be broken down into the two general genres or modes: spoken discourse and written discourse. We cannot stop here though, as there are yet many different subgenres within these two larger categories. Y.R. Chao, in his monumental study of spoken Chinese (1968: 17) has suggested that spoken discourse falls into the following categories:

1) monologues read from a manuscript (radio news)
2) dialogues of a play written realistically but read stiffly (movie, play scripts)
3) extempore speeches from sketchy notes
4) connected conversation, such as dialogues
5) monologues with interposed action (demonstration lecture)
6) dialogues under same conditions as above

7) occasional remarks made during action and/or event (playing a game, dinner party, etc.)

8) things said in response to some situation or to something in the stream of consciousness

Whether or not one agrees with Chao's proposed varieties of spoken discourse, the important aspect of this list is that it clearly shows the great diversity of different contexts or varieties of spoken language. It is significant to note that these subgenres of spoken discourse begin with rather formal, prepared-in-advance speech (number 1) to very spontaneous, informal speech as in number 8. This notion of formalities of discourse has been observed and analyzed by both Chafe (1982) and Ochs (1979). Chafe proposes that discourse falls under the following four categories (1982: 36):

1) informal spoken language (dinner table conversations)

2) formal spoken language (lectures)

3) informal written language (letters)

4) formal written language (academic papers)

As Chao did, Chafe also puts discourse on a plane that progresses from spontaneous, informal language to non-spontaneous, formal language. Ochs (1979) proposes a similar but slightly different approach to explaining the different varieties of discourse. Rather than use the formal/informal paradigm she opts for using the notions of planned versus unplanned. According to her study unplanned spoken discourse consists of informal spontaneous speech such as casual conversations. Planned spoken discourse consists of
planned spoken speech; unplanned written discourse consists of spontaneous, casual written language; and planned written discourse consists of formal writing, such as expository prose. These two similar approaches, Chafe's and Och's, are valuable in that they successfully identify important varieties and fundamental differences in discourse.

Longacre (1983) has also proposed that all discourse falls into four distinct categories or notion types. They are narrative discourse (the telling of past experience), procedural discourse (describing how to do it, how it was done, or how it takes place), behavioral discourse (broad category including exhortation, eulogy, political speeches, etc.) and expository discourse (explanations). These four notion types can apply to both written and oral discourse. For example, oral procedural discourse can be seen readily on television cooking shows where a person is describing how to cook a particular dish. On the other hand, written procedural discourse is typical in cookbooks and other how-to type manuals. These notion types can also be reflected in Chafe and Ochs theories in that each of these notion types can be described within the context of the informal/unplanned or formal/planned paradigm. Inherently, some types of discourse exhibit specific formal or informal characteristics. For example, some notion types such as expository discourse exhibit more features of formal discourse, while other notion types such as narrative discourse exhibit more features of informal discourse.

Notwithstanding these important contributions to understanding different varieties of discourse we can further break down discourse into even more specific varieties. We mentioned above that discourse can be either monologic or dialogic. Within the realm of monologic discourse we have several forms, such as narrative, expository, and procedural. These variations can exist in both spoken or written modes. Numerous other varieties of discourse also exist, such as: jokes, sermons, editorials, cartoons, letters, casual notes, professional writing, legal writing, memos, telephone discourse formalities, storytelling,
analysis of laughter, parent-child discourse, doctor-patient discourse, classroom discourse, courtroom discourse, meetings discourse, and so on. Each of these ultra-specific subgenres, all of which are compatible with Chafe's formal/informal paradigm of discourse, can provide interesting and meaningful insight into the understanding of language.

1.3 The Rationale for a Discourse-based Approach

In that I have elected to use a discourse-based approach in this study to analyze Chinese, it is appropriate here to explain the rationale for doing so. I will first identify the differences in data collection between traditional approaches and discourse-based approaches.

The main difference between the discourse analyst and the traditional linguist is the nature of the data and how it is studied. The traditional linguist typically uses a single sentence or group of sentences in an attempt to explain or illustrate a particular linguistic feature. This type of data rarely includes disfluencies in speech such as false starts, hesitation, hedges, rewording, etc. which traditionalists feel should not be accounted for as part of the grammatical knowledge of a native speaker. Very often it is the case that the set of sentences analyzed in this kind of framework are constructed by the analyst himself, based on his or other native speakers' intuitions. This type of sentence sample has been identified by Lyons (1977:622) as system-sentences. System sentences are "abstract theoretical constructs, correlates of which are generated by the linguist's model of the language-system in order to explicate that part of the acceptability of utterance-signals that is covered by the notion of grammaticality." These types of sentences are useful in helping us understand the limits of grammaticality or acceptability of a language. In other words,
this kind of data is especially useful in providing examples of what is not acceptable in the language in question.

Discourse studies are more concerned with what Lyons calls text-sentences. These are defined as: "context-dependent utterance-signals (or parts of utterance-signals), tokens of which may occur in particular texts" (622). One of the potential drawbacks of relying solely on the system-sentence approach is that linguists in the formalist tradition seek to generate rules of grammar that are applicable one hundred percent of the time (Brown and Yule, 1983). In so doing, there is a tendency to manipulate or "force" the language to fit the rules devised by the linguist. This often results in arguments about the acceptability of a particular sentence among a wide range of speakers. Occasionally, it is finally agreed upon that a dubious sentence is in fact grammatical. However, the context that must be created to make it grammatical is not only construed and restricted, but also so limited that for all practical purposes the sentence would never occur in natural speech or writing. This type of data is often so far removed from its communicative context that it is very difficult to accept as a "good" sentence even though it may conform to so-called grammatical rules. Though there is a place for this type of analysis, in general it is probably safer not to rely solely on this kind of approach, but to supplement it with other kinds of data, such as discourse.

This is a particularly tricky problem in Chinese linguistic studies because of the great diversity of the Chinese language and its many dialect groups. Even when sample sentences are checked with native informants for acceptability, often those informants all belong to one dialect group, and feel that their variety of Chinese is standard. And if a sentence is grammatical to them, they then assume it is grammatical to all other speakers of Chinese as well. Relying solely on this kind of approach has been the cause of a considerable amount of disagreement in academic discussions.
The discourse analyst uses natural language as produced by native speakers, and looks for regularities instead of rules (Brown and Yule 1983). This view is more applicable to natural data because this kind of data is full of non-categorical phenomena. In a text of natural language, data does not fit neatly into categories that are easily explained by concrete rules. Brown and Yule (1983) explain that the regularities that the analyst describes are based on the frequency in which they appear in a discourse sample. If a particular feature has a high rate of occurrence then it may be a categorical phenomenon and qualify as a regularity. In addition to this, natural discourse can be analyzed to look for regularities to see how they differ from abstracted grammars. For example, a particular grammatical feature of a language can be analyzed so as to provide a picture of the functional use of that particular feature in a natural context.

Because this study sets out to analyze the differences between spoken and oral language, particularly narratives, it is only fitting that actual narratives produced by native speakers of Chinese be used as the data for this study. In the traditional approach, sentences, or utterances, could be generated for analysis and checked with native speakers, but this approach would be more speculative in nature than relying on actual complete narratives. Additionally, to generate the types of non-categorical features that we hope to capture in spoken discourse would prove to be quite difficult. Seldom are informants aware of the mistakes, repetition, stammerings, and other disfluencies that are apparent in their spoken discourse.

In light of this discussion, the discourse analyst examines language from a functionalist's point of view. In order to provide the groundwork for a description of the Chinese language based on both the spoken and written language it is in our best interest to point out some fundamental differences between spoken and written discourse. The most effective and convincing way of doing this will be to take a discourse-based approach to
analyze spoken and written narratives produced by native speakers of Mandarin Chinese. By so doing we will be able to gain a different perspective of how the language is used by native speakers of Chinese on a daily basis in an authentic context.

I will now discuss the importance of context in the analysis of language as well as address some pedagogical implications of discourse research.

1.3.1 Context

Longacre (1983), a long-time proponent of a discourse approach to linguistics, has said that "language is language only in context." He goes on to say: "It is plain to see that a sentence taken from its matrix in a discourse can ultimately be understood only by reference to the linguistic context from which it comes" (Longacre, 1983:337). He continues: "In any utterance but those of very simple structure, the linguistic constructions which occur are found in linguistic context"(337). When one undertakes to analyze a sentence or phrase divorced of its context it is nearly impossible to ascertain its true semantic character. Of course, it is possible to artificially create an appropriate context for an abstracted sample of the language. Though this is possible, in questionable cases, it is more reliable and convincing to provide a sample of the particular feature of the language in an authentic, naturally occurring context. It is difficult to argue with what was actually said by a native speaker of the language, especially if it is shown that numerous speakers also produce the same feature. In essence the point to be made here is that oral discourse has a high degree of contextualized speech.

Furthermore, one cannot dismiss the importance of society and how societal processes interact with language. Davis (1990:42) quoted J.R. Harris in this regard: "The meaning of any particular instance of everyday speech is intimately interlocked not only with an environment of particular sights and sounds, but deeply embedded in the living
processes of persons maintaining themselves in society. In essence, language, particularly spoken discourse, cannot be separated from its context in society.

Perfetti (1987) indicates that in written discourse the printed sentences hold the meaning whereas in oral discourse meaning oftentimes lies outside of the verbal exchanges, lying instead in nonverbal exchanges—e.g., eye contact, gestures, etc.—between the speakers. Of course when one looks at an entire written discourse text, and the tradition in which it was wrought, there is sufficient context to understand the semantics of the data. However, the problem lies in the danger of taking sentences or phrases out of their natural context to analyze individually in order to support some theory or preconceived idea.

A classic example of analyzing a sentence without its appropriate context comes from the Chinese sentence below:

Tā lái le.
s/he come LE

This particular sentence has at least five different interpretations depending on the context in which it appears. Chan (1980) has pointed out that this sentence may have the following meanings:

1) He came. (completed action)
2) He's coming. (i.e. he's about to come)
3) He's coming (now) (i.e. he's on his way)
4) He has come. (i.e. he has arrived)
5) He comes (now). (implying that he didn't use to)
Looking at this Chinese sentence in isolation gives one no clue as to which situation it refers to. A native linguist can effectively identify the possible contexts through introspection, as we have done above. But it is only when we can identify this sentence in a naturally occurring context (i.e. a discourse text), then we have a built-in support system that can be drawn upon to explain the function of that particular feature. If a particular function of the grammatical item in question is doubted, it can be supported by the context in which it appears. The traditional introspection approach can provide us with a good guess, and then those guesses can be further strengthened and supported by showing its use in a native speaker's speech. If one can find ten native speakers that all use the grammatical item in a particular function, then there is strong evidence indicating the validity of the description originally construed in isolation.

The context argument is particularly applicable to the case of aspect in Chinese. Because aspect markers in Chinese are inherently ambiguous, in that the perfective marker and the inchoative marker are homonyms (both marked with the morpheme 1e), it is that much more important that a study of the Chinese aspectual system uses natural discourse as the core for its data. Very few works on aspect in Chinese, in the past, have attempted to describe it as it occurs in natural discourse texts, at least spoken texts. Those that have seem to skirt the issue of ambiguity.

We have shown here that context is an essential ingredient in the understanding of language. Though initially we may speculate on possible contexts that fit a particular feature of the language, analyzing discourse provides the further support, and allows us to understand better the language and its grammatical, lexical, and organizational functions.
1.3.2 Pedagogical Implications

It is assumed that one important purpose of studying and analyzing a language is to understand it better in order to be able to teach it more effectively. At least this should be the goal of those involved in foreign language instruction. The advantages of analyzing discourse and applying what has been learned in the classroom has been discussed by several researchers in recent years (see McCarthy and Carter 1994; Hatch 1992; McCarthy 1991; Horowitz and Samuels 1987).

McCarthy and Carter (1994) have observed that:

the functions of language are often best understood in a discourse environment and that exploring language in context forces us to revise some commonly held understandings about the forms and meanings of language. In the case of grammar, in particular, the focus on text and discourse can help us to notice and analyse aspects of usage which have previously gone unnoticed and untaught. One connected argument here is that the better a text analyst the teacher can be, the better equipped--all other things being equal--his or her students are likely to be in using the language appropriately.

Because natural discourse texts provide built-in context, both social and cultural, the more students are exposed to this type of language, the more likely they will be able to use the language they have learned in its appropriate social and cultural context. Though it may not be totally practical to expose students of a foreign language to naturally occurring discourse from the very beginning, it nevertheless is an important aspect of their language training. The more they are exposed to natural language the more equipped they will be when they are introduced to the target language environment. The great majority of foreign language textbooks teach a language that is usually contrived for instructional purposes, resulting in language that frequently sounds "canned" and unnatural. Students are thus not exposed to the real language, but rather to a nice, clean, variety of the language that no one really speaks natively. This has sometimes been referred to as "textbook language."
Using natural discourse texts changes the approach in which we teach the language. The roles of the teacher and the student consequently change also. The typical language learning process progresses from the language text (or dialogue) to performance of that sample. In this scenario the learner is first presented with the definitions of words and other grammatical descriptions that are prerequisite to performing the language task. When using natural discourse texts, the approach is very different. In this scenario the learner is first confronted with the language situation, and then is given information concerning what happened, and how the language caused it to happen according to the social and cultural context of the exchange. In other words the student begins with the language sample first and then it is deconstructed with linguistic, cultural, and social explanations. From here students then learn how to perform like functions in the language patterned on the context and other factors presented in the discourse sample.¹

Many textbook writers shy away from slang, colloquialisms, and other non-standard language varieties. In discourse texts the analyst often finds examples of ungrammatical or awkward utterances. While the textbooks teach that something is ungrammatical, by analyzing the discourse we may find that though technically it is ungrammatical, at least according to the grammarians, it is nevertheless a common feature of the language. If the feature regularly occurs in the target language communities then there is strong evidence that it should be learned or at least noted by students. Aspect in Mandarin Chinese is an example of a feature that varies in discourse from the typical descriptions in textbooks. This will be explored in more detail in Chapters Four and Five. With regards to explaining aspect particles in Chinese, analyzing discourse is valuable in that a variety of uses of the particles can be observed. In so doing a more complete description of these particles can be obtained.

Horowitz and Samuels (1987:14) have argued for including both written and oral discourse when engaging in the study of language comprehension. They state:

it is clear that literacy research, be it the study of reading or writing, cannot advance with certain precision without a greater understanding of speech, speech processing, and above all, the speakers engaged in communication acts. A more comprehensive study of language comprehension must include oral and written language--and the language users involved.

In addition to standard textbook learning, it is equally important that learners are also exposed to natural language, in both written and spoken genres. To come to a greater understanding of the language and perhaps more importantly, to become more proficient in the language, students must have training in both written and spoken discourse.

In that most communicative speech acts involve more than a sentence or two, it is important that students study and analyze language in connected stretches of discourse. This will enable the student to see the language in its proper context. Memorizing vocabulary items or common phrases, or structural patterns out of context only inhibits their ability to use them in a relevant context later on, and is an unproductive practice.

Using both spoken and written texts not only increases the knowledge of the learner but also allows for a more integrated and comprehensive approach to dealing with the language. The teacher must come up with more innovative and interactive ways both to introduce the language and to prompt learners in its use.

Proceeding from this rationale for analyzing discourse in this study, particularly the differences between spoken and written discourse, we will discuss some important works dealing with this topic as a groundwork for the analysis of Chinese in later chapters.

1.4 Spoken versus Written Discourse

In this section I will analyze several of the leading works on spoken and written discourse. Rather than present an exhaustive treatment, I merely attempt to point out the
main approaches and arguments so that we can understand better the major differences between spoken and written discourse.

It is an accepted fact that people do not speak the same way they write. In recent years there has been a growing number of studies analyzing the differences between spoken and written discourse (see Tannen 1982a, 1982b; Horowitz and Samuels 1987; Chafe and Danielwicz 1987). These two genres of discourse not only differ in the medium in which they are created but also in the kinds of language that are produced in speaking and writing, the cognitive and social reasons for their differences, the uses people have for speaking and writing, and the different effects spoken and written discourse have on people (Chafe and Danielwicz 1987). In addition to these differences we also see more specific features such as lexical, syntactic, and structural or organizational variation between spoken and written discourse.

For Chafe there are two extremes of "spokenness" and "writtenness." Conversational speaking is at one extreme and academic writing is at the other (Chafe and Danielwicz 1987). As mentioned earlier and repeated below, Chafe (1982) divides spoken and written discourse into four convenient categories. They are:

1) informal spoken language, from dinner table conversations,
2) formal spoken language, from lectures,
3) informal written language, from letters,
4) formal written language, from academic papers.

Each of these categories fit on a scale from informal on one end to formal on the other. All other genres and types of discourse may conveniently fall into the scale at some point. Informal language is typically spontaneous, casual, and often loosely organized. Formal
language is not spontaneous but rather, well organized and thought out. Along these lines Halliday (1987) explains that spoken discourse is active as opposed to written discourse which is reflective.

Ochs (1979) has developed a framework similar to Chafe's, but instead of explaining language from the vantage point of spoken and written, she identifies the process in which language is created by making a distinction between planned and unplanned discourse. Unplanned discourse lacks forethought and organizational preparation. Spoken discourse often falls into this category. Planned discourse, on the other hand, is well thought out and organized prior to its expression. This is most typical of written discourse. According to her framework we have the following categories:

1) Unplanned spoken language.
2) Unplanned written language.
3) Planned spoken language.
4) Planned written language.

These categories are very similar to Chafe's framework in that discourse is placed on a scale with unplanned or informal discourse at one end and progressing to planned or formal discourse at the other end of the scale.

Redeker (1984) has also provided a list of factors that help describe variation in language, particularly between spoken and written discourse. Her guidelines are:
1) Amount of planning.
2) Expected level of formality in situations.
3) Nature and size of audience.
4) Subject matter.

She basically confirms Chafe's findings that spoken discourse is more involved and fragmented than written texts and that written texts are more integrated. She explains that typical spoken discourse is: unplanned, informal, typically directed to a limited number of speakers that are generally known to the speaker and interact with the speaker and provide feedback. Spoken discourse also often deals with personal experience. Written discourse typically contains the following features: it is well planned, well polished, and is generally descriptive and explanatory in nature.

These categories are helpful in providing an accurate, and uncomplicated view of the range of characteristics that can be found in discourse texts, whether they be spoken or written.

1.4.1 Integration vs. Involvement

Chafe (1982) bases his theory of the characteristics of spoken and written discourse on two main assumptions: one, speaking is faster than writing (and slower than reading); and two, speakers interact with their audiences immediately, whereas writers do not. Beaman (1982: 45) sums up Chafe's thoughts on this matter when she says: "The speed of reading works with the slowness of writing create an 'integrated' and 'detached' quality in written language as opposed to the 'involved' and 'fragmented' nature of speech." Indeed, the spontaneity, informality, and lack of planning in spoken discourse in comparison to written discourse provide some of the major factors for their differences. Tannen (1982a)
likewise states that sequences of information in spoken discourse seem to follow the speaker's thoughts. In written discourse ideas are combined into a single sentence. The figure below provides a graphic representation of Chafe's features of spoken and written language (from Beaman 1982).

![Figure 1: Spoken vs. written discourse](image)

This graph effectively shows the relationship between spoken and written discourse and the features that they exhibit most. As the graph shows, spoken and written discourse are on opposite sides of the scale. Writing contains features of integration and detachment, that is detachment from its audience. Spoken discourse, on the other hand, is highly fragmented and involved; that is, the speaker is highly involved with the audience or the receptive moment. Fragmentation in spoken language is typically apparent in the stringing together of clauses or idea units without any connectives. Tannen (1982: 8) has effectively summarized Chafe's findings of the various devices that make speech involved and writing integrated.
Involvement

a) Devices by which the speaker monitors the communication channel (rising intonation, pauses, requests for back-channel responses).
b) Correctness and imageability through specific details.
c) A more personal quality; use of first person pronouns.
d) Emphasis on people and their relationships.
e) Emphasis on actions and agents rather than states and objects.
f) Direct quotation.
g) Reports of speaker's mental processes.
h) Fuzziness.
i) Emphatic particles (really, just)

Integration

a) Nominalizations.
b) Increased use of participles.
c) Attributive adjectives.
d) Conjoined phrases and series of phrases.
e) Sequences of prepositional phrases.
f) Relative clauses.

Because writing is so much slower than speaking there is a considerable amount of time that allows for a better organized text. Chafe (1982: 37) states that as a result of this "we have time to integrate a succession of ideas into a single linguistic whole in a way that is not available in speaking...In writing we have time to mold a succession of ideas into a more complex, coherent, integrated whole, making use of devices we seldom use in speaking."
With regards to the speech process he says: "In speaking, we normally produce one idea unit at a time." This then explains why there are so many disfluencies in spoken discourse. By disfluencies we mean false starts, repetition, self-correction, hedges, rewording, long pauses, filler words like *uh, um*, etc.

Ochs' characteristics of unplanned spoken discourse and planned written discourse share many of the characteristics of Chafe's framework of integration and involvement. The characteristics she proposes are outlined below (also from Tannen 1982).

**Unplanned spoken discourse**

a) Dependence on morphosyntactic structures learned early in life.

b) Reliance on immediate context to express relationships between propositions.

c) Preference for deictic modifiers (*this* man).

d) Avoidance of relative clauses.

e) Preponderance of repair mechanisms.

f) Use of parallelism: repetition of:

   i. phonemes.

   ii. lexical items.

   iii. similar syntactic constructions.

g) Tendency to begin narrative with past tense and switch to present.

**Planned written discourse**

a) Complex morphosyntactic structures learned later in life.

b) Lexicalization of relationships between propositions in formal cohesive devises and topic sentences.

c) Preference for definite and indefinite articles (*a man, the man*)
d) Use of relative clauses.

e) Absence of repair mechanism.

f) Less use of parallelism.

g) Tendency to use past tense in narrative.

According to these principles we find that informal (unplanned) spoken discourse is not in any way polished. Rather, it typically consists of a long string of short clauses or idea units connected into a somewhat coherent whole by coordinators and by the temporal sequence of the events being described. Writing, on the other hand, typically consists of a well organized, coherent, series of complex and integrated sentences.

Chafe (1982) explains that written discourse is more syntactically complex for a number of reasons. Nominalization was the most characteristic device found in Chafe's data. He found eleven and one half times more occurrences of nominalizations in written discourse than in spoken discourse. He also found that in spoken discourse there were four times as many coordinating conjunctions than in written discourse. Attributive adjectives was also an area that he found a significantly higher occurrence in written than in spoken discourse. Other devices he found frequently used in written discourse are: participles, sequences of prepositional phrases, complement clauses, and relative clauses. Ochs essentially agrees with Chafe in saying that written discourse is more compact, using more complex structures that tend to be more concise.

1.4.2 Other Contributions

Many other scholars have contributed to the understanding of the differences between spoken and written discourse. Drieman (1962) claims that written texts are shorter than spoken texts, they have longer words, have more attributive adjectives, and they have
more varied vocabulary. Chafe and Danielwicz (1987) also argue that written language, no matter what purpose or subject matter involved, uses a more varied vocabulary than spoken language. Speakers have a narrower range of lexical choices and are thus more limited in variety because they have less time to choose. Written vocabulary uses older words, and words that have passed out of spoken use. According to Chafe and Danielwicz, vocabulary can be termed as colloquial, literary, or neutral. They also claim that idea units ("spurts of language" in oral discourse are comparable to the sentence in written discourse) in written texts are longer than in spoken texts. This is related to the idea that spoken idea units are limited in size by the short-term memory or focal consciousness of both the speaker and the listener. Writers have no such limitations. They also point out that spoken discourse uses chaining techniques to link the various idea units together and that speakers avoid elaborate syntactic relations among clauses.

Devito (1966, 1967) claims that in written discourse there are fewer words used to refer to the speaker. Likewise there are fewer quantifiers and hedges, and there is greater abstractness. Horowitz and Samuels (1987) propose that oral language is episodic and narrative-like in nature with features of deixis, prosodic cues (stress, pitch, etc.), and paralinguistic devices. Writing, on the other hand, hinges on the past and is reconstructed so it can be processed by readers in the future. In this regard written discourse is secondary to spoken discourse. They claim there is more cohesion and variety in written discourse by way of: lexical choices, nominalization, anaphoric relations, cataphoric relations, and signal words or cohesive ties.

Tannen (1982a) postulates that spoken discourse is highly contextualized, while written discourse is decontextualized. In spoken discourse, cohesion is established through paralinguistic and non-verbal channels (tone of voice, intonation, prosody, facial expression, and gesture). In written discourse cohesion is established through lexicalization
and complex syntactic structures and there is more subordination and other foregrounding or backgrounding devices. In her framework, spoken discourse is active and written discourse is passive. Tannen (1982b) further shows that there tends to be less interpretive descriptions in written discourse than in spoken discourse. In spoken discourse there is a greater tendency to give interpretive or evaluative descriptions in addition to narrative descriptions. Written discourse sticks closer to a state-the-facts approach leaving out commentator-type expressions. She states that interpretation is a way of acknowledging the interpersonal involvement of the speaker and listener. In narratives, Labov and Tannen also explain that the structure of the discourse is influenced by the temporal sequence of the events reported.

1.4.3 Opposing Views

Not all researchers agree with the views and ideas discussed above. Halliday (1987), though in agreement with some of the very general characteristics described above, does not agree with some of the fundamental propositions. He agrees that written discourse has higher lexical density but argues that it is grammatically simple compared to spoken discourse. Spoken language, on the other hand, is lexically sparse but grammatically intricate. He claims that Chafe and others have used grammatical rules or principles based on the written language to measure the complexity of spoken discourse. Under these unbalanced conditions the written language of course scores very high and the spoken language rates very low in terms of grammatical complexity. He claims that neither written nor spoken discourse is more complex than the other; rather, they are organized differently. Halliday explains that spoken discourse accommodates more clauses which makes it grammatically intricate and complex. He argues that spoken discourse is more complex because the listener has to deal with so many clauses, keep everything straight, and not get
confused. He further argues that written discourse is less grammatically complex because it contains fewer clauses, though there may be more lexical items in each clause.

Beaman (1982) agrees with Halliday in claiming that spoken discourse, on the whole, is just as complex as written narrative. She claims that because there are a greater number of dependent clauses to deal with in spoken discourse it is more complex. Beaman also agrees that both genres of discourse are complex in their own ways. In her study of coordination and subordination she claims that spoken narrative shows more finite subordinate clauses, which is interpreted as low lexical density, and written narratives exhibit more non-finite subordinate clauses, interpreted as high lexical density. The bottom line is that Halliday and Beaman feel that spoken discourse is just as syntactically complex as written discourse, and that one mode of discourse cannot be measured by rules derived from the other.

Halliday's claim that the number of clauses in a discourse sample is related to syntactic complexity is rather weak. Syntactic complexity relies on the internal structure of clauses and how they are linked or related to other clauses. Furthermore, lexical density, that is, the type and amount of words used, does give rise to greater complexity. For example, Chafe's explanation of nominalization and other features provides adequate evidence for the complexity of written discourse.

Halliday and Beaman may have a valid point when they expressed that it is unfair to use rules of written grammar to analyze spoken discourse. However, this point too can be argued. I am not so sure that the rules or grammar used to analyze discourse data are wholly based on the written language. No doubt a great deal of it is for those languages with a history of a written language. However, one cannot discount the fact that oral language always precedes written language in literally all cultures of the world. When linguists write grammars of a language, it is probably accurate to say that most grammatical
rules reflect a combination of both written and spoken characteristics, though they may lean to the written side. We also point out that if we do not use the grammatical rules that we know and are familiar with, what do we use? This is the framework that we are all comfortable with. It may not be worth the trouble to attempt to come up with a new set of standards especially since spoken language is always in a constant state of change. To describe the differences between spoken and written discourse the grammatical rules in existence now are probably the best guidelines we have. They have the greatest potential for identifying differences. In this light, if we were to use a grammar based on the spoken language it would then also provide the basis for vast differences with the written language as the spoken language would conform to these guidelines.

1.5 Outline of this Study

I have thus far provided a foundation from which to work in this study. I have given a working definition of discourse as well as provided reasons why analyzing discourse is important to this study. A survey of the existing literature on the differences between spoken and written discourse has also been provided. This has given us a better understanding of the fundamental differences between spoken and written discourse so that when we examine the Chinese data we will have some guidelines to follow and will be able to decide if Chinese discourse shares the same features as other languages (primarily English).

In Chapter Two a discussion of the data used in this study and the theoretical frameworks that have been adopted will be presented. An explanation of the source of the data, why it was selected, and how it was used will be included in this discussion. A theoretical framework of discourse analysis will be discussed as well as a theory of aspect. In chapter three we will analyze the Chinese data and examine the major differences
between oral and written narrative discourse in Chinese. This will include identifying those types of features that were discussed in chapter one, along with others unique to Chinese. This discussion will include a brief analysis of a prior work on the differences between spoken and written Chinese and also provide some data on the historical evolution of the written language. This will be followed by a chapter dealing specifically with the viewpoint aspect in Chinese and how it functions in both written and oral narrative Chinese discourse. Differences, similarities, and a general pedagogical description of the perfective -le and -guo, the inchoative le, the zero aspect, and how resultative verb complements, verb repetition, and the existential yǒu relate to the viewpoint aspect will be given. In chapter five we will summarize our findings, compare them with Erbaugh's (1990) pear film database, indicate the significance of what has been learned, and conclude the study with an attempt to answer some questions as well as to raise additional questions for further study in this area.
CHAPTER II
DATA AND THEORETICAL BASE

In this chapter I will discuss the data used in this study as well as provide a
discussion of how it was collected and why. I will also describe the theoretical base for the
syntactic analysis.

2.1 Source of Data

Because this is a study of narrative discourse the first matter to consider was where
to obtain a good sampling of this genre of discourse to examine. Analyzing oral and written
narratives also dictated that two comparable samples of each genre be used. As Tannen
(1982) has pointed out, the majority of studies on the differences between spoken and
written discourse compare one oral genre against a different written genre, such as,
informal spontaneous conversation versus academic writing (formal, planned written
discourse). There is no doubt that this kind of study probably yields the greatest variance
between spoken and written discourse. However, comparing the same genres, in this case,
narratives, we can gain greater insight into the more specific variations that exist. It is not
just the obvious differences that become apparent but also the less obvious, more obscure
differences. The variance pointed out between the same genre, as we attempt to do in this
study, will provide added validity to the variation between spoken and written discourse, in
general.

The first choice was to examine casual conversations that had been recorded earlier
for another project. This data consisted of numerous hours of conversation recorded both
in Taibei and Beijing, by Robert Sanders. Though this data is extremely valuable for many different kinds of analysis, especially conversation analysis, coming up with an equivalent written genre proved to be quite difficult. Chafe roughly equates personal letter writing as being informal, spontaneous written discourse. However, letters do not reflect dialogue as it is portrayed in conversation. Dialogue produced in literature was a possibility but it was felt that this was really not the same as casual, spoken dialogues. In other words, they were not related enough to merit a comparative study. Furthermore, it proved to be problematic and very time-consuming to extract samples of "narration" from this collection of data. A source that could serve as a base for both oral and written narratives was needed.

2.1.1 The Pear Film

The so-called "pear" film produced under the direction of Wallace Chafe at the University of California at Berkeley, turned out to be an ideal source for this study.¹ This short, seven minute film, which contains sound but no dialog, depicts a series of simple events that can be very easily understood by nearly anyone around the world. As Chafe has pointed out, the film was produced for the express purpose of analyzing how people talk about what they have experienced and later how they recall these experiences. The relating of past experiences has been defined by Labov (1972) as narrative discourse. He defines it as: "recapitulating past experiences by matching a verbal sequence of clauses to the sequence of events which (it is inferred) actually occurred." As the purpose of this study is to analyze narrative discourse, the depicting of a series of events in the "pear" film would serve as a uniform, and homogenous source for narration, both oral and written. Though informants would not be relating their own experiences, relating scenes or experiences they have witnessed or observed serves the same purpose when it comes to the inhereat features

of narrative discourse. For the many studies that have been based on the "pear" film, including this one, it has been an excellent source for eliciting narrative discourse samples.

2.1.2 Description of the Pear Film

The following description of the "pear" film is quoted from Chafe’s (1980) preface. It is concise, yet includes all the important events depicted in the film.

The film begins with a man picking pears on a ladder in a tree. He descends the ladder, kneels, and dumps the pears from the pocket of an apron he is wearing into one of the three baskets below the tree. He removes a bandanna from around his neck and wipes off one of the pears. Then he returns to the ladder and climbs back into the tree.

Toward the end of this sequence we hear the sound of a goat, and when the picker is back in the tree a man approaches with a goat on a leash. As they pass by the baskets of pears, the goat strains toward them, but is pulled past by the man and the two of them disappear in the distance.

We see another close-up of the picker at his work, and then we see a boy approaching on a bicycle. He coasts in toward the baskets, stops, gets off his bike, looks up at the picker, puts down his bike, walks towards the baskets, again looking at the picker, picks up a pear, puts it back down, looks once more at the picker, and lifts the basket full of pears. He puts the basket down near his bike, lifts up the bike and straddles it, picks up the basket and places it on the rack in front of his handlebars, and rides off. We again see the man continuing to pick pears.

The boy is now riding down the road, and we see a pear fall from the basket of his bike. Then we see a girl on a bicycle approaching from the other direction. As they pass, the boy turns to look at the girl, his hat flies off, and the front wheel of his bike hits a rock. The bike falls over, the basket falls off, and the pears spill out onto the ground. The boy extricates himself from under the bike, and brushes off his leg.

In the meantime we hear what turns out to be the sound of a paddle ball, and then we see three boys standing there, looking at the bike boy on the ground. The three pick up the scattered pears and put them back in the basket. The bike boy sets his bike upright, and two of the other boys lift the basket of pears back onto it. The bike boy begins walking his bike in the direction he was going, while the three other boys begin walking off in the other direction.

As they walk by the boy’s hat on the road, the boy with the paddle ball sees it, picks it up, turns around, and we hear a loud whistle as he signals to the bike boy. The bike boy stops, takes three pears out of the basket, and holds them out as the other boy approaches with the hat. They exchange the pears and the hat, and the bike boy keeps going while the boy with the paddle ball runs back to this two companions, to each of whom he hands a pear. They continue on, eating their pears.

The scene now changes back to the tree, where we see the picker again descending the ladder. He looks at the two baskets, where earlier there were three, points at them, backs up against the ladder, shakes his head, and tips up his hat.
The three boys are now seen approaching, eating their pears. The picker watches them pass, and they walk off into the distance.

### 2.2 Data Collection

Collecting both oral and written narratives was desired in that a reasonable degree of homogeneity could be preserved by having the same person produce both an oral narrative and a written narrative of the same events. By so doing these two genres of narrative could be analyzed in their purest forms. The ideal result would then be an oral narrative that was spontaneous and informal and a written narrative that also exhibited these characteristics and that was produced by the same individual.

#### 2.2.1 The Informants

In the original pear film experiment, twenty informants from each language were selected to participate. Chafe (1980), or any of the others that reported their findings provided any kind of explanation as to why twenty informants were selected instead of ten, thirty or fifty. Linguistic studies vary a great deal on the number of informants used depending on the nature of the study. Generally speaking, for this kind of study, ten to thirty informants is considered to be the acceptable range. Though thirty is perhaps ideal, ten nonetheless is considered acceptable. In studies that deal with individual variation (such as by gender, class, age, and so on) the number of informants becomes a more critical issue. In studies of this kind, the purpose is to accurately describe some linguistic phenomena of that particular group of individuals. If you have too few informants then the data can be skewed. However, in a study like this one, where we are only attempting to give some generalizations about the features of spoken and written narratives, the number of informants is not a critical issue. Many published studies (Cumming 1984; Yong 1993;
Tannen 1982c) use a variety of informants (i.e. transcripts) ranging from as few as one to those that use many more.

It was felt in this study that ten informants would be an adequate number. This decision then ruled out the possibility of using existing data in Chinese such as Mary Erbaugh's twenty pear film narratives since they consisted entirely of spoken narratives.

That ten informants is sufficient is further validated by an analysis of Erbaugh's spoken narratives. The total number of aspect markers (perfective and inchoative i.e., resultative verb complements, and verb reduplication) in her study was tabulated and compared with the numbers from this study. The results showed that the findings from our ten narratives was nearly identical to findings in Erbaugh's narratives. The differences were found to be very slight (these numbers will be analyzed in Chapter Five), suggesting that in analyzing differences between spoken and written narrative discourse, no advantage is gained in to having more than ten informants.

Hence, ten informants participated in this experiment. They produced a total of twenty narratives, ten oral and ten written. All ten informants were native Chinese, between the ages of 20 and 40 years. Except one informant who was the wife of a graduate student, they were either undergraduate students or graduate students at The Ohio State University. Needless to say all were highly educated and articulate individuals. Five of the informants were from Taiwan, and five were from Mainland China. The five Mainlanders were from various parts of China. Perhaps the ideal situation would be to have a more homogenous group, such as all speakers from Beijing or Taibei, which might reduce probable variation. However, despite the fact that the informants in this study come from different areas of China, they all, nevertheless, were highly educated and spoke "standard" Mandarin Chinese.

Even though the informants in this study came from different parts of China, it turned out that the narratives produced were all very consistent when it came to syntax,
organization, and other features (these areas will be explored in Chapters Three and Four). The only noticeable variation that occurred was lexical in nature. For example, all the informants from Taiwan referred to a bicycle as jiāotàchē, whereas the Mainlanders referred to it as either zìxíngchē or dānchē. Those from Taiwan referred to the basket used to collect the pears as either lánzi or lōuzi, whereas all the Mainlanders referred to it as kuāngzi.

The informants that participated in this experiment produced a valuable glimpse of the way the Chinese language is spoken in Taiwan and on the Mainland, and varied primarily in lexical choice.

2.2.2 The Experiment

The informants for this experiment were invited in advance to watch a short film as part of a research project. They were also told that after watching the film someone would ask them some questions regarding what they saw. Four informants showed up for the first viewing, five for the second, and one individual viewed it alone. This particular informant was actually late for one of the scheduled sessions, but did the experiment in the same format as the other informants. His narratives did not show any great variation with the other informants. Before each of the viewings the informants were asked to watch the short film. They were told nothing regarding its contents or even its title. At the conclusion of the film the informants were ushered out of the room, one by one into a private office where an interviewer was waiting. The interviewer was also a native speaker of Chinese. With an audio tape recorder running, the interviewer first asked the informant a few questions regarding their background, such as, where they were from and so forth. The purpose of these questions was to put the person at ease before they began their narrative, and to find out a little more about the person's background. The interviewer then told the informants that she had not seen the film that they just saw (she really had not), and asked if they
would tell her about it. The question was intentionally a little broad so as to allow the informants to express their thoughts in any way they wished regarding the events in the film. When they were finished with the interview the informants were directed to another room where they were equipped with blank sheets of paper and pens. At this point they were given the instructions to produce a written description of the film that they just watched. The informants were then allowed as much time as they wanted to produce a written narration of the "pear" film. All informants produced their narratives within five to twenty minutes after viewing the film.

There were a variety of options that could have been pursued in the design of this experiment. Informants could first produce the oral narrative and then the written narrative, or in the reverse order.

There were two reasons for having them first give the oral narration, then the written one. First, it was felt that giving the oral narration first would prevent the more fabricated or structured written version from influencing the oral version; and second, this way corresponds to child language acquisition, that is speech before writing. This procedure was followed for all ten informants. There were a variety of ways possible to conduct this experiment. However, if the written narratives were produced first then the production of the written narrative could possibly influence the oral narrative.

Another way to do it would be to have the informants watch the film then give a spoken narrative, then a week later watch the film again and provide a written narrative. The reasoning behind this was that perhaps after giving a spoken narration the informants were tired and anxious to leave, thus allowing the possibility of rushing the written narratives. This procedure was decided against because I felt it was important that the production of both narratives come from the same knowledge base. That is, it was felt if the informants were allowed to see the film a second time, the chances of them remembering more, and thus producing a much more detailed narrative was more likely.
For these reasons, the present procedure was decided upon despite the possible
drawbacks that may result.

The complete text of each of the oral and written narratives are contained in the
appendices of this study. Appendix A consists of the oral narratives, and Appendix B
consists of the written narratives. Both sets of narratives are composed of Chinese
characters. The oral narratives are arranged by idea units (this notion is explained in
Chapter Three). Each line of the texts represents one idea unit. The written narratives are
arranged in sentence and paragraph form as they were produced by the informants with all
punctuation marking retained from the originals.

2.3 Theoretical Background

In this section I will discuss various theoretical issues regarding aspect. In section
2.3.1 I will address the relationship of narrative discourse and aspect based on the works
of Hopper and others. In this discussion I will address the issues of the nature of narrative
discourse, the significance of temporal sequence in narrative discourse, and the prevalence
of the perfective aspect in narrative discourse.

In section 2.3.2 we will turn to a theory of the viewpoint aspect in Chinese based in
part on the work of Smith (1991). Her theory will be amended somewhat to include other
important functions of the aspectual system that she does not treat in her work. This theory
will also be adapted to fit a discourse-based analysis.

2.3.1 The Nature of Narrative Discourse

In that narrative discourse is a unique genre of discourse it is in order to explain
some of the basic features of this type of discourse. A narrative clause has been defined by
Fleischman (1990:157) as one that: "contains a unique event that, according to the narrative
aorn, is understood to follow the event immediately preceding it and to precede the event
immediately following it." This definition implies that temporal sequence plays an important role in the production of narrative. Consequently, narrative discourse proves to be rich in aspeclual features. Hopper (1979b) points out that narratives follow an iconic order, that is, the events in a narrative succeed one another in the same order as in the real world. This means that when someone is producing a narrative (i.e. telling about some past experience) it is standard procedure to describe the events in the same order as they really occurred. In light of these definitions, it is not difficult to see that aspect plays a significant role in narrative discourse. As Hopper (1979b: 219) states: "Aspect considered from a discourse perspective is a device or set of devices which exists in order to guide the language user through a text." Since one event must be completed before the next event is described, the perfective aspect plays a significant role in the syntactic and semantic function of narrative clauses. Hopper even goes so far as to say that aspect should be regarded as a discourse phenomenon.

Tai (1985; 1989) has also noted that Chinese word order to a large extent reflects order in the world. That is, word order follows the conceptual ordering of things in the world. These views will be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three.

2.3.1.1 Foregrounding and Backgrounding

Hopper (1979a, 1979b) provides a clear and effective description of narrative discourse by making a distinction between the features of foregrounding and backgrounding. Foregrounded events succeed one another according to real-life temporal sequence as was mentioned above. Foregrounded clauses provide the actual narration or concrete narrative. Backgrounded events, on the other hand, usually amplify or comment on the events of the main narrative. In other words the function of foregrounding is to narrate, and the function of backgrounding is to comment on the narrative. In light of these definitions, clauses in narrative discourse can be described as either narrative clauses
or evaluative clauses. Narratives consist primarily of foregrounded clauses. The distinction between foregrounded and backgrounded clauses as well as their differences in spoken and written discourse will be discussed in Chapter Three.

2.3.1.2 The Perfective and Imperfective Aspect in Narrative Discourse

Hopper explains that in a narrative, the perfective aspect dictates chronological sequencing. In narratives the perfective aspect is realized in the foregrounded clauses and the imperfective aspect is realized in the backgrounded clauses. Backgrounded clauses "may be located at any point along the time axis or indeed may not be located on the time axis at all" (Hopper 1979b: 215). Furthermore, in backgrounded clause there is a greater likelihood of topic changes or new information being introduced in the pre-verbal position. In foregrounded clauses there is very little new information introduced in the subject. New information is generally introduced in the predicate, either in the verb, or in the combination of verb and complement. Since perfective aspect is associated with verbs, this further strengthens the argument that it is the perfective aspect that appears in foregrounded clauses and the imperfective that shows up in backgrounded clauses. Hopper (1979b: 221) sums up the relationship aspect plays in a narrative in these words:

The aspects pick out the main route through the text and allow the listener (reader) to store the actual events of the discourse as a linear group while simultaneously processing accumulations of commentary and supportive information which adds texture but not substance to the discourse itself.

The table below (from Hopper 1979a) provides the characteristics of the perfective and imperfective aspects in relation to discourse texts.
Table 1: Characteristics of perfective and imperfective aspect in discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strict chronological sequencing</td>
<td>Simultaneous or chronological overlapping of situation C with event A and/or B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of event as a whole, whose completion is a necessary prerequisite to a subsequent happening</td>
<td>View of a situation or happening whose completion is not a necessary prerequisite to a subsequent happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity of subject within each discrete episode</td>
<td>Frequent changes of subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked distribution of focus in clause, with presupposition of subject and assertion in verb and its immediate complements (or other unmarked focus)</td>
<td>Marked distribution of focus, e.g., subject focus, instrument focus, focus on sentence adverbials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human topics</td>
<td>Variety of topics, including natural phenomena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic, kinetic events</td>
<td>Static, descriptive situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foregrounding. Event indispensable to narrative</td>
<td>Backgrounding. State or situation necessary for understanding motives, attitudes, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table clearly shows the most salient features of both the perfective and the imperfective aspects in narrative discourse. In the pear film database used in this study we have found that it is possible for the perfective aspect to occur in a backgrounded clause, but it is rare. Typically, backgrounded clauses either have no aspectual marking at all (but with an imperfective interpretation) or they are marked explicitly with imperfective aspect markers.

Li, Thompson, and Thompson (1981:19) support this view as it relates to the aspect system in Chinese. They state:
the Perfective is used to relate or narrate ongoing events, while the Imperfective is used to provide information on ongoing, concurrent, background happenings. The distinction is most easily seen in narrative discourse, where the Perfective clauses conveying the main story-line events, presented in sequential order, each denoting a discrete event which is contingent on the completion of the prior one, contrast sharply with the Imperfective clauses signaling the supporting, on-going, durative, or habitual events, which occur as "ground" to the perfective "figures.

This study deals specifically with the perfective aspect and there will be no attempt to make a descriptive or detailed analysis of the imperfective aspect. The information provided concerning the imperfective aspect is merely to illustrate the differences it exhibits in contrast to the perfective aspect.

A study of the aspect system (particularly the viewpoint aspect) in Chinese can be effectively undertaken with the analysis of narrative discourse. Not only can we provide evidence for the general differences between spoken and written narrative discourse, but we also have ample data on the perfective aspect as it occurs abundantly in narrative texts. In the next two chapters we will examine these differences. But first we will outline the theoretical base for our examination of aspect in Chinese.

2.3.2 Aspect in Chinese

In this study an attempt is made to describe aspectual marking in Mandarin by analyzing it as it occurs naturally in narrative discourse. Thus we will focus on its occurrence in discourse rather than in the individual sentence. Sentence-based approaches are not necessarily inferior as they are originally derived (one way or another) from some form of discourse. In this sense, both approaches are related and can be complementary.

In a typical sentence grammar, aspect is described according to the syntactic function of the individual markers. Sentences are isolated from their context, at least they are analyzed as an independent unit, and aspect is described in terms of where it appears in the sentence and what its function is in relation to other parts of that sentence. When the
analyst attempts to bring semantics into the picture we are coming closer to a discourse grammar. When we include social and cultural context, and not limit our analysis to a single sentence, then we are expanding into the realm of a discourse-based analysis. This study will adapt existing theories originally established, for the most part, as sentence-based approaches, and adapt and apply them into a discourse-based approach.

In this discourse-based approach we will analyze aspectual marking as it applies to the situation and context of the situation that it appears in. For example, rather than describe perfective le in Mandarin Chinese as a marker of perfectivity that occurs after a verb and indicates completion, we approach the problem from a different angle. According to the context and the situation or event being spoken about, if the notion of completion is essential to the successful communication of the idea, then it is requisite that the verb of the clause be marked by the speaker (or writer) with the aspect marker le. This will be discussed further below.

I will first set up a framework of aspect in Chinese, and then apply it to the narrative discourse texts to see which aspect markers occur where in the texts.

There has been much debate in the past over the aspect system in Mandarin Chinese. Much of the controversy has centered around the question of one aspectual le in Chinese or two le's as separate grammatical morphemes. At this point we will not engage in a lengthy discussion of this issue. For this study I have adopted the two le treatment of aspect in Chinese following the ample data that has been provided in favor of this approach (see Chao 1968; Li and Thompson 1982; Wang 1965; Kwan-Terry 1979; Chan 1980; Smith 1991; and Christensen 1990, to name a few). In general, we base our conviction on the positioning of the two morphemes as dictated by the social situation and context in a discourse text. One le occurs post-verbally as a suffix and indicates perfectivity and the other le occurs in the sentence final position and has the primary function of inchoativity. We also note the regular occurrence of both markers in the same sentence conveying two
separate and distinct meanings. The two samples below show the difference between a sentence with perfective aspect alone and with both the perfective and sentence final le. These sentences appear without context for the sole purpose of showing their most basic function.

(1) Wǒ xiěle liǎngpiān wénzhāng.
   I writeLE twoCL essay
   I wrote two essays.

(2) Wǒ xiě le liǎngpiān wénzhāng le.
   I writeLE twoCL essay LE
   I have written two essays (so far).

In these sentences, there is a clear distinction in meaning. (2) can be used to indicate that the action is not yet complete, that there are more essays to be written in addition to the two already written. If we were presented with the appropriate context this would be more apparent. From a discourse perspective, we can imagine a context for (1) that would necessitate the use of the perfective marker to make the communication successful. For example, if someone were describing a series of events that he participated in yesterday, if the clause above, I wrote two essays, happened before one event and after another, the context would dictate the use of the perfective marker, or at least a perfective interpretation of that event. The same type of situation can be applied to (2) in that the context surrounding this sentence ultimately dictates its meaning.

In some situations one morpheme le occurs in the sentence-final position and yet the context conveys both a meaning of inchoativity and perfectivity. In situations like this, because le does not occur post-verbally, which is a necessary condition for it to convey
perfectivity, we interpret this as the verb occurring with the zero aspect. In other words, there is no overt aspecual marking after the verb, but the context clearly indicates a perfective meaning. This kind of situation is illustrated in (3) below. The zero aspect will be discussed in more detail in section 2.3.3.2.

(3)  Wǒ xiě liǎngpiān wénzhāng le.
     I write twoCL essay LE
     I have written two essays (now).

Some researchers do not include sentential le in a treatment of aspect, but instead they treat it as a sentence final particle (see Li and Thompson 1981; Smith 1991). There are two reasons why we wish to include sentential le in our discussion of aspect. One, according to the strictest definitions of aspect (see Comrie 1976 and Lyons 1977) the semantic notions stativity, progressivity, duration, completion, habituality, iteration, momentariness, inception, and termination all fall under the umbrella of aspecual analysis. At least one of these notions, inception or inchoativeness, and the related notion of change of state, are prominent features of sentential le in Mandarin Chinese. The second reason stems from the fact that both morphemes are written and pronounced identically (as le). This gives rise to several problems. Without context, it is sometimes difficult to determine which le is being used in a given utterance. In the context of the narratives collected for this study we will be able to provide a more accurate description of this marker and how it relates to the perfective marker. There are also occasions when le occurs in post-verbal position and sentence-final position simultaneously and bears both perfective and inchoative meanings, as we shall see in (4) below. In other words one marker performs two functions. This notion was noted by Christeasen (1990). The sample from Chapter
One, (from Chan 1980: 59), cited below, shows the dual functionality of le occurring in the sentence final position.

(4)  Tā lái le.
      s/he come LE

As Chan has clearly pointed out, this sentence has at least five different meanings depending on the context. At least one of these definitions includes both a perfective meaning and an additional meaning simultaneously.

(5)  a. He came (completed action: perfective).
     b. He's coming (i.e. he's about to come: imminent action).
     c. He's coming (now) (i.e. he's on his way: inchoative).
     d. He has come (i.e. he has arrived: perfective & inchoative).
     e. He comes (now) (implying that he didn't use to: change of state)

(5d) includes both perfective and inchoative meanings. This example further illustrates the benefit of analyzing these features from a discourse perspective. All of the different meanings indicated above are applicable to an appropriate context in discourse. In other words, in a discourse text, the context of situations or events requires the specific marking to make the utterance both relevant to the surrounding discourse and meaningful to the situation as a whole.

Chao (1968) explains that in Mandarin Chinese the principle of haplogogy prevents the use of two le's together as in *Tā láile le. He claims that when the context dictates a dual meaning the additional le is absorbed into the first one. In other dialects
such as Cantonese, where the perfective verb suffix is not homophonous to the sentence final particle, it is perfectly acceptable to have the two markers occur side-by-side. Example (6) below illustrates this point.

(6) Kéuih lèihjó la.
s/he comeJO PRT
S/he has come.

In this sentence, jó is the equivalent of Mandarin perfective le and la is the equivalent of sentential le. This Cantonese example provides further evidence of the fact that a sentence final le has the potential of indicating both perfectivity and inchoativity at the same time.

These arguments provide ample reason to not only treat Mandarin le as two separate morphemes but also for treating sentential le as part of the aspect system in Chinese.

2.3.2.1 Inchoativity and Perfectivity

Comrie (1976) defines the perfect aspect as "The perfect links a present state to a past situation, whether this past situation was an individual event, or a state, or a process not yet completed..." (62). In more general terms he says "... the perfect indicates the continuing present relevance of a past situation" (52). Li and Thompson (1981) and Li, Thompson, and Thompson (1982) have adopted these definitions in defining the sentential le as indicating a Currently Relevant State (CRS). When we analyze the sentential le in narrative discourse we discover that indeed, for most cases, the function of the particle is in accord with Comrie's definitions. The notion of the inchoative aspect has been addressed earlier by Chan (1980) and Christensen (1990). The idea of inchoativity, that is the
inception of a new idea, situation, or state, can also be described under Comrie's definitions of the perfect aspect. The inchoative aspect marker links the present state, or the inception of a new idea or state, with a past situation, or the old state or situation. This phenomenon in Chinese adheres to Comrie's definitions of the perfect aspect. The example below shows the typical usage of the inchoative aspect.

(7) Xǐāo háizi huī zǒu le.
small child know how walk LE

The small child can walk (now). (implying that he couldn't before)

In (7) the old situation or state is one in which the child could not walk and the new situation is one where the child can walk.

When the inchoative aspect marker le occurs after an adjective (stative verb) it indicates a change of state as in the example below.

(8) Tā piàoliàng le.
she pretty LE

She is pretty (now)/She has become pretty.

In this example, in the prior state, the girl was not pretty, but in this current or new state she has become pretty, thus undergoing a change of state. The concept of change of state is very similar to that of inchoativity. For this reason the notion of change of state falls under the influence of the inchoative aspect. As with inchoativity there is a change from one old state to a different new state. The inchoative aspect does not require that any action take place at speech time. As Comrie's (1976: 62) definition stated that the perfect aspect can refer to "a process not yet completed." In this regard, in some contexts the inchoative
aspect indicates imminent action, or the inception of a new situation that is on the verge of happening. The example below illustrates this usage.

(9) Wǒmen zǒu le.
we   go  LE
Let's go (now).

In this sentence, the action has not yet occurred, or the new situation has not been realized, but it is about to, with the full intention that it will. When the inchoative aspect marker occurs in an imperative sentence it likewise carries the meaning of inception of a new situation even though that situation is only assumed at the time of speech and has not actually occurred. (10) below illustrates this.

(10) Chī fàn le.
   eat  meal  LE
Let's eat (now).

In this sentence, as in those above, the assumption is that the action, or new situation (the eating of a meal in this case), is about to occur and it is assumed that it will indeed occur. This interpretation again, is dependent on the context or situation that occurs in the discourse text. Ultimately it is the situation in the context of the discourse text that determines both the meaning of the utterance and the aspectual marking that it will need to convey that meaning.

In narrative discourse the basic communicative function of the sentence-final le is to indicate the inception or change of a condition or state (inchoativity), thus falling under the conditions of the perfect aspect. There is no doubt that, in other genres of discourse, the
sentence-final le may carry other interpretations besides inchoativity, as has been described by Li and Thompson (1981; 1982) and Chao (1968). As Li and Thompson have pointed out with their theory of sentence-final le indicating a Currently Relevant State, there are other conditions that meet the description of the perfect aspect. The perfect aspect then is not exclusive to inchoativity, rather inchoativity is one of the conditions that can be described within the domain of the perfect aspect. In this study, we have found that the inchoative aspect is the perfect aspect interpretation that is common in narrative discourse. This interpretation is derived from the discourse function of this marker in narrative discourse.

The perfect aspect is clear in sentences containing only the inchoative le. Sentences containing both a perfective le and an inchoative le, may have both a perfective and a perfect interpretation. Example (11) below, extracted from our narrative data illustrates this.

(11) Liăngge yǐjīng zhuāngle hěn duō le.
     twoCL already fillLE very much LE
     Two (of them) have already been filled (now).
     (referring to baskets of pears)

In this sentence we see that perfectivity and inchoativity are both overtly marked and expressed in the meaning.

2.3.3 A Broader View of Aspect in Mandarin

Chan (1980), Smith (1991), and others have broadened our view and interpretation of aspect by not relying solely on syntactic analysis but also dealing with the semantic
functions of aspectual marking. Smith has analyzed aspect beyond the typical confines of actual aspect markers and has included in her treatment of aspect, other strategies used in Chinese to indicate perfectivity. These include the use of post-verbal guo, resultative verb complements, verb reduplication, and the elusive zero aspect (the absence of aspectual marking in a phrase when there is an aspectual meaning). These features have been left out of most other treatments of aspect. One thing that her treatment does lack is an analysis of sentential le and its relationship to the aspect system. She claims that the sentence particle le primarily indicates speaker attitude and emphasis. She even states: "They may have other functions, and may overlap in some ways with the aspectual system" (p. 345). However, she does not attempt to explore the matter further.

In this section I will outline a few of Smith's ideas on aspect as well as some other pertinent information to lay the foundation for our analysis in Chapter Four. I will also analyze the sentential le and the morpheme you commonly used in Taiwan Mandarin. In 2.3.2.1.1 we will look at the viewpoint aspect which includes the perfective viewpoints (le, guo, and RVC's) and the imperfective viewpoints (zài and zhe). In 2.3.2.1.2 we will outline the zero aspect, followed by a look at the Taiwan use of you and its relationship with aspect.

2.3.3.1 The Viewpoint Aspect

In Smith's theory, viewpoint refers to how you look at a situation, either looking from an internal point of view (i.e. durative, imperfective) or from an outside point of view (i.e. perfective). The viewpoint aspect then consists of both the perfective and the imperfective viewpoints. In short, the imperfective presents a situation from an internal viewpoint and the perfective presents a situation from an external viewpoint. Because this study focuses on the perfective aspect we will only mention here that the imperfective aspect contains the durative or progressive markers zài and zhe.
The Perfective Viewpoint consists of the perfective verb suffixes le and guo, and Resultative Verb Complements. Smith actually refers to le and guo as perfective morphemes and RVC's as morphemes associated with perfection. In this study we will refer to all three as perfectivizing agents.

The verb suffix le presents a simple, closed event. According to context, le can either indicate termination or completion. The following examples are typical uses of perfective le cited from Smith (1991: 345).

(12) Wǒ zuótiān xiěle yīfēng xìn.
     I yesterday writeLE oneCL letter
     I wrote a letter yesterday.

(13) Tāmen zuótiān zài gōngyuán chǎole yījià.
     they yesterday in park quarrelLE one-fight
     They quarreled yesterday in the park.

(14) Zhāngsān zài zhōngwǔ dàoole shāndǐng.
     Zhangsan at noon arriveLE hilltop
     Zhangsan reached the top at noon.

Example (12) above conveys termination rather than completion. Tai (1984) has clearly shown how perfective le can indicate both completion and termination, as in his examples (p. 292)
(15) Wǒ zuótiān huàle yīzhāng huà.
    I yesterday paintLE oneCL picture
    I painted a picture yesterday.

(16) Wǒ zuótiān huàle yīzhāng huà, kěshì méi huàwǎn.
    I yesterday paintLE oneCL picture, but not yet paint-finish
    I painted a picture yesterday but I didn't finish it.

Here, (15) indicates completion, that is, the painting of the picture was complete. (16), on
the other hand, indicates mere termination, that is, the process of painting, which occurred
yesterday, was terminated without having been completed.

However, depending on the context (15) above, could also indicate termination.
When the perfective le occurs with a resultative verb complement it unequivocally
indicates completion. (17) and (18), from Smith (346) illustrate this point.

(17) Wǒ zuótiān xiěwánle yīfēng xìn.
    I yesterday write-RVC-LE oneCL letter
    Yesterday I wrote a letter (& finished it).

(18) Tā xiūlǐhǎole yīge lùyīnji.
    s/he repair-RVC-LE oneCL tape recorder
    S/he repaired a tape recorder (& completed the repair).

These examples show how Mandarin separates the notion of completion with that of simple
closure (termination).
As mentioned previously, when the morpheme le occurs after a stative verb, the interpretation is dictated by the inchoative aspect marker, though Smith argues to the contrary. Smith argues that this usage of le is the perfective morpheme. We would argue that it is really the sentential or inchoative le. This is a common function of the sentential le, along with other functions such as change of state etc. This feature of the sentential le, which incidentally is not restricted to use in a stative situation, can be further illustrated in the examples below.

(19) Tā lái le.
    s/he come LE
    S/he's coming (now) (i.e. he's on his way).

(20) Xià yǔ le.
    descend rain LE
    It's raining (now).

Depending on the context, (20) can be interpreted as either purely inchoative, that is the inception of a new situation, or as a change of state. For an inchoative interpretation, the coming about of a new situation is the fact that it is raining now, whereas it was not before. For change of state, we would say that the prior state was not raining and the situation has changed to a state of raining. Granted, these interpretations are very similar, but they show that the function of inchoativity belongs with the sentential le and not with the perfective le. This provides greater consistency and cohesiveness.

The perfective guo should not be confused with the RVC guò. Guo provides additional information beyond the final point and indicates that the event occurred in the
past. In simpler terms, the perfective guo indicates that an event or situation has occurred at least once before in the past and may provide information beyond the final point. Smith uses the examples cited below to show the difference between the perfective le and guo.

(21) Tāmen shàngge yuè qùle Xiānggǎng.
they  lastCL  month goLE Hong Kong
Last month they went to Hong Kong (they may still be there).

(22) Tāmen shàngge yuè qùguo Xiānggǎng.
they  lastCL  month goGUO Hong Kong
Last month they went to Hong Kong (& they are no longer there).

She points out that perfective le gives no information beyond the final point of the situation. Thus in (21) all that the reader (or listener) knows is that they went to Hong Kong. In (22) perfective guo provides information beyond the final point in that context may dictate that the action of their being in Hong Kong has changed. This interpretation of guo can be attributed to the original meaning of guo as an experiential aspect marker. In these types of situations guo indicates that the action in question has been experienced at least once in the past. For example: Tā chīguo Zhōngguó cài, simply indicates that he has eaten Chinese food before. When we add a definite time frame, such as last month, the meaning shifts from experiential to perfectivity, as we saw in the example above.

RVC's convey a host of meanings, including completion, termination, achievement, direction, emphasis or lexical color, or a conversational implicature. Even though RVC's may co-occur with le and guo they alone also convey perfectivity. From the aspectual point of view there are three classes of RVC. The first class is the completive
or phase class (Chao 1968). This class is subdivided into two classes, the flexible and strict completion. Those in the flexible class may indicate completion or termination and include wán, hǎo, guò, etc. The others indicate strict completion and include zhǎo, chéng, etc. Examples in (23) are flexible and those in (24) convey strict completion ((23a) from Smith 1991: 354).

(23)  a. Tā bǎ gē chàngwánle.

s/he BA song sing-RVC-LE

S/he sang songs.

b. Tāmén kànguòle diànnshi.

they watch-RVC-LE television

They watched television.

(24)  a. Tā zài wǔ nián nèi xuéhuìle Fǎwén.

he in five year within studyRVC-LE French

He learned French within five years.

b. Tā mǎidào nèiběn shū.

he buyRVC thatCL book

He managed to buy that book.

Directional and result are the other two classes of RVC's. These types of RVC's affect the situation type and add lexical color to the perfective viewpoint. They oftentimes co-occur with other RVC's. Directional RVC's include shàng, qù, lái, etc. Result RVC's
specify a result state as a consequence of the action. Examples (25) and (26) below illustrate these two types of RVC.

(25) Zhāngsān lākāile nèige dàmén.
Zhangsan pull-open-LE thatCl gate
Zhangsan pulled the main gate open.

(26) Niǎo fēishàngqule.
bird fly-ascend-RVC-LE
The bird flew up.

Another way to indicate perfectivity in Mandarin Chinese is by verb repetition or as Smith terms it "tentative reduplication." Chao (1968) calls it the Tentative Aspect. Sentences that use a reduplicated verb may contain two different meanings. In some cases, as in (27) below, it indicates that an action occurs or will occur "a little bit." In these situations the meaning is not necessarily perfective but more suggestive or tentative in nature.

(27) Wǒ yào kànkan nǐde zázhì.
I want look-look youDE magazine
I want to take a look at your magazine.

In other contexts the reduplicated verb can indicate perfectivity, as in (28) below.
(28) Tā jiù pāipai tāde jiǎo.(H-O)
    he  then  pat-pat  hisDE foot

He then patted his foot a bit.

In this type of context we see that the reduplicated verb indicates perfectivity similar to a

case if the verb had a perfective le marker attached to it. The only difference would be that
the reduplicated verb indicates that the action occurred in a slight manner, whereas with the
verb suffix there is no such connotation. In this regard the reduplication of a verb is
different from the perfective suffix in that it cannot be used in the same types of situations.
(29) illustrates this point.

(29) *Wǒ yào kànle nǐde zázhī
        I  want  seeLE  youDE magazine

2.3.3.2 The Zero Aspect

In Mandarin Chinese viewpoint aspect markers are syntactically optional. This
includes the use of RVC's as well. In other words, it is not obligatory to mark aspect at all.
This can lead to vagueness if one is not supplied with the proper context. Even then,
sometimes it is challenging to interpret the true meaning of what is being said, unless one is
an actual participant in the exchange. Smith regards the absence of an aspect marker as
"neutral" aspect which she considers a default. She suggests that the temporal schema of
the neutral aspect spans the initial point and at least one internal stage of the situation.
Though her characterizations of this phenomenon seem accurate I disagree with her term
"neutral." Neutra' suggests that there is no aspectual marking or interpretation. This,
however, is not the case since we know that even if an aspect marker is not overtly marked,
the interpretation frequently dictates an aspectual reading. For this reason "zero" aspect is a more accurate term for this phenomenon. The term zero is also used when discussing anaphoric relations to indicate where a noun phrase or pronoun has been deleted because the context makes the meaning clear without it. In such situations, even though there is no explicit marking, the noun phrase is implied in the meaning. In this regard zero aspect will be used to refer to places where an aspect marker has been deleted but when aspectual meaning is implied in the meaning.

Because there is no explicit marking in these situations the aspectual value may be either perfective or imperfective depending on the context. Smith provides the example cited below (1991: 364).

(30)  Zhāngsān xiūli yīge lùyīnjī.  
Zhangsan repair oneCL tape recorder  
Zhangsan repaired/is repairing a tape recorder.

In this sentence we may have a situation that may be ongoing (imperfective aspect), terminated, or completed (perfective aspect).

This is a particularly difficult feature of the aspect system to gauge and quantify in a discourse text. One may assume that in a narrative discourse, if there is no explicit aspectual marker, then it can be regarded as the zero aspect. Because of the optional nature of aspectual marking in Chinese (and it is quite common in some genres of discourse to not mark the aspect), this makes the zero aspect an important feature of the aspect system as a whole.

In narrative discourse data I have found that the zero aspect applies more to the perfective aspect slot than to the inchoative aspect. This will be explored in more detail in Chapter Four.
2.3.3.3 Other Aspectual Marking in Mandarin

It is known that in other dialects of Chinese, such as Cantonese, there are other ways to mark the perfective aspect. In Cantonese йт卩 (yǒu in Mandarin), functions as a perfective aspect marker. At least it seems to function in this manner. In the Mandarin spoken in Taiwan this word also functions in this manner. This possibility has been explored by Cheng (1985), when he compared Peking Mandarin, Taiwan Mandarin, and Taiwanese. For example, the examples below provide answers to the question: Did you eat it? (chīle méiyǒu).

(31)  a. Yǒu chī. (Taiwan Mandarin)

YOU eat
(I) ate (it).

b. Chīle. (Mainland Mandarin)

eatLE
(I) ate (it).

Likewise, it is acceptable in Taiwan to say:

(32)  wǒ yǒu chī fàn.

I  YOU eat meal
I've eaten.

These types of sentences (31a) and (32) sound very awkward and clumsy to the typical speaker of Mandarin from Mainland China. However, the fact of the matter is that these
types of sentences are produced in informal spoken discourse in Taiwan Mandarin as we shall show in Chapter Four. The use of this aspectual strategy is no doubt due to the influence of Southern Min commonly spoken on the island. Southern Min and Cantonese share this feature of the grammar. It should be noted that in written discourse, yóu used as an aspect marker seldom if ever occurs. It seems to be more common, (though not as common as perfective le) in informal, casual conversation. Thus it appears to be merely a feature of informal spoken discourse. I will present more data supporting this claim in Chapter Four.

William Wang (1965) postulated that yóu was indeed an aspect marker that was equivalent to perfective le and had gone through a transformation process changing from a pre-verbal position to a post-verbal suffix. He actually claims these two markers are "two morphs" that are "alternatives of the same morpheme"(1965: 458). He explains that yóu once existed in the language as an aspect marker but was phased out in favor of le. By saying this he is assuming that the two markers then are or were interchangeable, and thus equivalent. It is felt by this writer that in some contexts both markers have the same semantic function, that is to mark perfectivity, but that they are not exact equivalents. Wang also indicates that yóu as an aspect marker is no longer in use. In Standard Mandarin on the Mainland this is true, but Mandarin as commonly spoken in Taiwan either still retains the use of this word or that this usage has been borrowed from Taiwanese. Regardless of the fact that it was most likely borrowed from Southern Min, it nevertheless is actively used in Mandarin as spoken on the streets. In Chapter Four we will further explore this feature providing examples and more data.

2.4 Summary

The oral and written narratives produced from the Peal Film provide homogenous and uniform data to analyze the differences between these two genres of discourse.
Furthermore, they provide an ideal environment for the analysis of aspect in Chinese, especially when analyzing it from a discourse prospective. We have shown that it is the aspect system (along with word order) that carries a narrative and provides the temporal sequencing that is so important to narratives. Perfective clauses are used to narrate the events of the story (foregrounding), and it is imperfective clauses that provide background or supportive material to the story (backgrounding). The Perfect aspect relates to the perfective and imperfective aspect in that it coincides with them and in that it relates current or new situations to a reference time which is generally referred to by perfective or imperfective aspects. By looking at aspect in this light, its pragmatic and contextual function, we learn that aspectual marking is motivated by discourse, particularly spoken discourse. Li, Thompson, and Thompson (1984) have shown that sentential le occurs very rarely in expository, scientific, and descriptive writing, and it is practically non-existent in news-reporting, speeches, lectures, proclamations (26). Our findings, as will be reported in Chapter Four, support this claim, at least that the sentential le occurs less frequently in written narratives than in spoken narratives.

We sum up our framework for viewpoint aspect as follows:

1. **Perfective le**: occurs in post-verbal position and indicates completion or termination; optional marking.

2. **Inchoative (perfect) le**: occurs at sentence-final position or after a stative verb (adjective) and indicates the inception or change of a state or condition.

3. **Perfective guo**: occurs in post-verbal position and indicates that action or event has occurred in the past. Oftentimes it is used when there is an expected occurrence of some action.

4. **RVC's**: occur in post-verbal position and indicate perfectivity by means of completion, termination, achievement, result phase, etc.
5. **Verb Reduplication**: in certain environments a reduplicated verb may indicate perfectivity.

6. **Perfective 你**: occurs in pre-verbal position and indicates completion.

7. **Zero Aspect**: generally replaces perfective and imperfective aspect marking.

In this study we will apply these features of the Chinese aspect system to the oral and written narratives that have been elicited. We will provide a description of where and why these aspect markers occur and their productivity in narrative discourse.
CHAPTER III
VARIATION IN ORAL AND WRITTEN MANDARIN
NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

Mandarin Chinese is similar to other languages, English in particular, in that there is a great deal of variation between oral and written discourse. These variations range from differences that are obvious and easily identifiable to those that are more difficult to observe casually. In this chapter we will examine several differences between oral and written narrative discourse in Mandarin Chinese. The data for this chapter and subsequent chapters, as it was explained in Chapter Two, comes from the oral and written narratives elicited from watching the "pear" film. All citations, unless otherwise noted, come from the oral and written transcripts obtained from the viewing of the "pear" film. All translations are by this author.

Chafe's notions of integration and involvement are generally applicable to the data collected here. The features of integration, for the most part, do apply to the features found in the written narratives but the features of involvement apply more toward dialogic conversation. Inasmuch as the data used in this study is monologic, these features are not always directly applicable. However, many of the features of the oral narratives can be applied, though sometimes indirectly, to the general framework of involvement. We will apply several of the characteristics of spoken and written discourse discussed in Chapter One to our data. Our purpose is to point out some general differences between the two genres of discourse so as to understand more fully their uniqueness. There are an abundance of syntactic and lexical variations alone that could merit separate and interesting
studies. It will suffice for our purposes here to illustrate several important and salient features and leave the rest for future analysis.

It should be noted from the onset that there is no such thing as "pure" spoken discourse or "pure" written discourse. Typically genres of spoken and written discourse contain elements of both. Taking this into account it is not the intention of this study to describe the characteristic of a purely spoken or written genre of discourse. Rather, some characteristics of spoken and written narratives specifically will be described and analyzed.

We will begin this chapter by outlining the main points of a paper by Li and Thompson (1982) titled "The Gulf Between Spoken and Written Language: A Case Study in Chinese." This is one of the very few works on the differences between oral and written discourse in Chinese. This brief overview will give us some important historical information concerning the Chinese language. We will then look at some general features of oral and written narrative discourse in Chinese in section 4.2. This will set the stage for the more detailed discussions that follow. In section 4.3 we will analyze the significance and ramifications of narrative length. This will be followed in section 4.4 with an analysis of the idea units in each of the narratives. In 4.5 we will address the issue of the amount of detail in the narratives and in 4.6 we will look at the narratives in terms of narrative versus evaluative clauses. Lexical variation between oral and written narrative discourse will be discussed in 4.7 and syntactic variation will follow in section 4.8. We will discuss some general syntactic features, as well as third-person pronoun and zero anaphora marking, modification phrases, and temporal sequencing. We will then summarize our findings in 4.9.
3.1 Oral and Written Chinese Discourse in Historical Perspective

Li and Thompson (1982), is one of the few studies that attempts to juxtapose the oral and written languages in Chinese and identify their differences. They begin their study by stating that the modern Chinese writing system is unique in that it is semantically rather than phonologically grounded. Each character or logograph in Chinese represents a semantic or grammatical unit. According to Li and Thompson, it is this foundation that has created and maintained the gulf between the spoken and written language in Chinese (77). Though this may have contributed to the differences, it should be noted that there is ample evidence that the Chinese writing system is based to a significant degree on phonological considerations.

Li and Thompson err in their study when they discuss Classical Chinese. They indicate that the differences between spoken and written discourse is primarily due to Classical Chinese. By making such a statement, they fail to acknowledge the existence of literary Chinese which consequently is not equivalent to Classical Chinese. Li and Thompson erroneously put Classical Chinese in the early Qin, or 3rd century B.C. In reality the Classical Chinese period, as Norman (1988) points out, was from the 5th century B.C. to the 2nd century B.C. After this period there was a transition from Classical Chinese, *guwen*, to literary Chinese or *wenyan wen* which lasted until the end of the dynastic period in 1918. The key to understanding the differences between oral and written discourse then begins with literary Chinese and not Classical Chinese. Therefore, when Li and Thompson mention Classical Chinese, they are really referring to literary Chinese. Li and Thompson point out that even though Classical Chinese (actually literary Chinese) was thought to reflect the spoken language, its extreme brevity and telegraphic nature cause one to wonder if this really was the case. We know that later, from about the Qin period (2nd century B.C.) on, there became a more clear distinction between spoken Chinese and
literary Chinese, or that kind of Chinese that was used exclusively for writing. The evolutionary development of the written language in Chinese then starts with Classical Chinese, moves to literary Chinese, then finally evolves into modern written Chinese. Li and Thompson state that the differences between modern Mandarin and Classical (literary) Chinese are as significant as the difference between English and modern Mandarin (80). There are also vast differences between literary Chinese and modern Chinese as well. Classical (and literary) Chinese is rampant with zero anaphora and grammatical features are scarce. According to their study Classical Chinese (again, which is actually literary Chinese) lacks aspect markers, articles, demonstratives, markers for number, gender, and case, complementizers and subordination markers (80). This makes Classical (and literary) Chinese dense, terse, and oftentimes difficult to understand. They go on to say that because of the monosyllabic nature of Classical Chinese words, and the highly condensed and telegraphic nature of the language, clauses are much shorter than in modern Mandarin (the latter more than twice as long according to their experiment)(81-82).

In that all modern written Chinese shares features of both the spoken language and literary Chinese, the question posed by Li and Thompson is how much of a modern written text is spoken Mandarin and how much is literary Chinese. They conducted an experiment and analyzed several issues of the monthly political propaganda magazine in the PRC, Learning, and found that every single page had words or phrases from Classical Chinese. Keep in mind that political literature is supposed to be the most colloquial by government regulation. In other types of literature classical Chinese figures even more prominently (85) This case clearly indicates that literary Chinese is still a very integral part of the written language today. In fact, as we shall see below, literary Chinese has significantly influenced the grammar and lexicon of the modern written language.
Another important factor that has kept the spoken language different from the
written language is based on the nature of Chinese characters. They state:

in the written language the relationship between the semantic unit and the
written unit (logograph) is essentially one-to-one, while in the spoken
language, the relationship between the semantic unit and the phonological
unit (the syllable) is many-to-one.

What this essentially means is that the spoken language has had a dramatic increase in the
number of bisyllabic words through compounding and affixation in order to address the
problem of homophony. Assuming that the written language was originally based on a
monosyllabic structure, the written language was not as closely tied to phonology as the
spoken language and therefore was not under the same pressure to expand. The result of
this evolutionary process is that where a bisyllabic unit is used in the spoken language, a
monosyllabic morpheme is often used in written discourse. A simple example, provided by
Li and Thompson, is the use of suffixes in spoken discourse where it is not necessary in
written discourse, i.e. wū is acceptable in written discourse whereas wūzī is the acceptable
form in spoken discourse. This all results in a written language that is succinct and
condensed, unlike the written language (88).

In sum it is important to restate here the evolutionary process of the written
language in China and to emphasize the point that Classical Chinese is not equivalent to
literary Chinese, even though literary Chinese was closer to Classical Chinese than it was
to the vernacular. Literary Chinese differed in that it allowed more intrusions from the
vernacular language. Literary Chinese survived into the twentieth century as the accepted
way to write and only faded with the rise of the written vernacular, baihua. Today literary
Chinese is basically a "dead" language though as we will see later in this Chapter, the
influence of literary Chinese figures prominently in the structure and lexicon of modern
3.2 General Features of Oral and Written Narrative Discourse

Before we begin a more detailed analysis of the variation between oral and written discourse in Chinese, we will first point out some very basic and general characteristics between the two genres of discourse. By so doing we will be able to understand better the more technical differences that will be discussed later.

In looking at two transcripts, one an oral narrative, and the other a written narrative, it is relatively easy to determine which is which. There are certain features that immediately jump out and tell the reader that one is an oral narrative. These features include false starts, repetition, hedges, self-correction, pauses, and often a relatively disjointed structure. These types of features are especially apparent in spontaneous, informal, oral discourse like casual conversations, as opposed to more formal oral discourse, such as a radio broadcast or a lecture. Chafe's notion of involvement is accountable for these unique features inherent in spontaneous oral discourse. Tannen also suggests that because spoken discourse follows the thought process of the speaker, these disfluencies are readily apparent. Chafe (1987) also notes that because writing is so much slower than speaking there is a great deal of time to think about what one is going to express before the discourse is actually created. A speaker, however, creates discourse on-the-spot and therefore has practically no time to plan and organize. These common disfluencies are the way in which speakers deal with this type of situation. Such factors as being put on the spot, and being expected to perform for someone (the interviewer) lead to these disfluencies. The very fact that you are face-to-face with the listener also brings the pressure to talk fluidly and intelligently. Written discourse, even spontaneous and unplanned, is almost always better organized and smoother than its oral counterpart. Below we will give several examples from the oral narratives to illustrate these uniquely oral features. All examples from the "pear" film data will be coded by two letters, the first designating the informant or speaker, and the second, the type of narrative,
"O" for "oral" and "W" for "written." Thus '(B-O)' encodes the excerpt as being produced by informant B, and is his oral narrative.

(1) yěhòu, tā jìù...
   tāmen jìù, tāmen jìù zǒule...(B-O)
   afterward, he then...
   they then, they then goLE...
   Afterward, he then...
   they then, they then left...

In this example we see several of the aforementioned features in use. We first see a false start and then self-correction. The informant first said tā jìù... What B really wanted to say was "they" and not "he." In the next utterance he corrected himself by saying tāmen jìù. The next feature we see is that of repetition. The informant repeats the phrase "they then" twice. The example below also illustrates the uniqueness of informal oral discourse.

(2) yīge mòxīgē de...
   oneCL Mexican DE
   A Mexican...
   yīge...
   oneCL
   a...
   yīge jìjiégōng...
   oneCL seasonal worker
   a seasonal worker...
zài nàr cǎi nàge...

at where pick that CL

at where picking those...

zài shù shàng...

in tree above

in a tree...

cǎi lízi...(E-O)
pick pear

picking pears...

In this example we see a fair amount of repetition, not only of the same word but also repeating the same idea or concept in different words. This strategy reflects the thinking and on-the-spot planning process in the mind of the speaker. As E thinks of what to say she adds new, but nevertheless somewhat repetitious information to keep the flow of the narrative and to avoid lengthy pauses. For example, she first says the pear picker is Mexican, then after pausing adds that he is a seasonal worker. In the phrase zài nàr cǎi nàge... she is either searching for the right word or cannot quite remember where the picker was picking the fruit, and what kind of fruit it was. In the next phrase she remembers and provides the correct information, "in a tree" and "picking pears." Regarding this strategy of spoken discourse, Tannen (1982a: 30) has says that a speaker "must account for the silence if she takes the time to think and, therefore, is likely to report her memory process, to let the audience know that she has not mentally checked out."

In written discourse we seldom see these types of strategies unless it is intentionally written for effect, like the speech of characters in fictional writing. This memory process that Tannen referred to seldom makes it to the paper. The speaker can plan in her mind
before committing it to paper. There were in some of the written narratives in this experiment corrections and so forth probably due to the spontaneous nature of the experiment. However, even in these cases corrections could be made by crossing out words, writing in the margin and using arrows to indicate where to place the new phrase and so forth. Even with these types of corrections, in the end, the narrations read smoothly because of the ability to edit before turning in the final version. This obviously was not possible with the oral narratives because literally every word spoken was recorded and transcribed. I emphasize the point here that even though there was some visible corrections on some of the written narratives, the majority of the planning and editing process is done in the writers mind before it is put down onto paper. However, I maintain that the written narratives remain spontaneous and unplanned, in that the writer could not take the narrative home to reflect on it and then submit a polished version later. These differences, both in planning and producing spoken and written narratives show an important distinction between these two modes of discourse. This obviously was not possible with the oral narratives because literally every word spoken was recorded and transcribed.

We will now look at some more specific and technical differences between oral and written narrative discourse in Chinese.

3.3 Narrative Length

The first and most obvious difference between the oral and written narratives is length. This comes as no revealing surprise as this is a very common feature in many languages, primarily English, but also Japanese, and Greek. This fact has been pointed out by Chafe and Danielwicz (1987), Chafe (1982), Tannen (1982a; 1992b), Drieman (1962), Ochs (1979), Halliday (1987) and others. They all agree that written texts are shorter, usually due to the compactness that comes with syntactic complexity. the amount of
planning involved, lexical density, and so on. The Chinese data analyzed for this study was found to be typical of other languages (Tannen 1982a for Greek; Clancy 1982 for Japanese; and Chafe 1982 for English) with regards to length of discourse texts.

Measuring length in these Chinese narratives can be done in various ways. To get a general feel for the total length of the narratives a simple count of the number of characters in each narrative is sufficient. However, merely counting the number of characters becomes problematic in that most Chinese words consist of more than one character, and many characters indicate a syntactic function rather than a lexical entity, such as aspect markers. Since it is quite obvious that people generally do not speak in nice complete sentences, dividing the oral texts into sentences as a unit of measure is therefore not a viable option. Thus, it is important to identify the common unit of speech that is representative in oral discourse, and use that unit of measure as a basis for determining a more accurate length of the discourse texts.

A number of different terms have been postulated for the common unit of speech in oral discourse. In the most basic description these units have been called "spurts of language" (Chafe 1982). Halliday (1967) called them "information units." Grimes (1975) called them "information blocks," Crystal (1975) uses the term "tone-unit," and Kroll (1977) and Chafe (1980) use "idea unit." The notion of "idea unit" will be adopted in this study. Chafe states that idea units can be identified by three obvious criteria: intonation, pausing, and syntax. Idea units usually end with a clause-final intonation pattern indicating either a rise in pitch which we conveniently mark with a comma, or a fall in pitch which we mark with a period. This intonation marking suggests a complete thought or idea. The second criteria is pausing. Idea units are usually separated by a brief pause. The length of this pause may vary. Again this feature seems to suggest the "completeness" of an idea. The last criteria is syntax. Idea units have a tendency to consist of a single clause, usually a
verb with its accompanying noun phrase. Idea units (hereafter I.U.'s), oftentimes begin
with a conjunction or coordinating word of some kind. Considering these factors, Chafe
(1982) speculates that idea units represent a single "perching" or "focusing" of
consciousness. A group of idea units that all relate to the same topic combine to form a
somewhat cohesive larger unit that some have called "centers of interest" (Chafe 1980) or
"cohesion clusters" (Cumming 1984). In spoken discourse these clusters of I.U.'s do not
always make up a complete sentence. In many cases they reflect what we call a run-on
sentence. For this study, the idea unit, is an appropriate unit in which to evaluate the oral
data.

The sentence is generally regarded as the basic unit of written discourse, and some
have continued to use this unit both in analyzing spoken and written discourse (i.e.
Cumming 1984; Beaman 1982). Cumming maintains that the sentence is still the best
descriptive unit to analyze discourse. She claims that Chinese sentences produced in written
and spoken discourse are very similar. In the data for this study I found that in most cases,
the oral narratives were not organized into complete and grammatical sentences. The written
narratives, on the other hand, were composed of well-formed sentences. The problem we
run into at this point is whether we can or should compare an idea unit from the oral
narratives with the sentence in the written narratives as some have done. Also, if this is not
a viable or complementary match up, then how do we analyze the written data? Chafe and
Danielwicz (1987) have said that idea units appear to be the natural unit in spoken
discourse, and integrated, elaborated sentences are the natural unit of writing. Though the
sentence seems to be the natural unit, for comparison purposes it is more appropriate to use
a more common unit for both spoken and written discourse. Chafe and Danielwicz (1987)
and Tannen (1982c) have given general guidelines that the natural "intonation unit" in
written discourse is the stretch of language between punctuation marks. Though they
provide little explanation for this notion, a few words are in order here. Producing
language, whether it be spoken or written, requires a person to create meaningful discourse
in manageable "chunks." These "chunks" are separated in spoken discourse by pauses,
tonation, and completeness of thought (as discussed above). Written discourse,
especially narrative discourse is, according to Tannen (1982c) patterned on an oral model.
In light of this written narrative discourse then should also be arranged, or created,
according to similar principles. These "chunks" or units in written narratives are then
separated by commas and periods as is the standard practice in writing. Chafe's principle of
idea units then can and should be applied to both the oral and written narratives. Idea units
in the written narratives are then separated by punctuation marks as provide by the
informants, with no editing by this writer or anyone else. These punctuation marks then
represent what the informant sees as divisions between significant units of discourse. In
this study I will use idea units (I.U.'s) to refer to units in both the written and spoken
narratives as it has been explained.

The main difference between the I.U.'s in the written data and that of the spoken
data is that in the written data, the I.U.'s are most often comprised of complete sentences.
In the other cases the I.U.'s combine to form complete sentences. In the spoken narratives
this was not the case. It should also be pointed out that while some informants were fairly
liberal with their placement of commas, others seldom used them.

Below are several examples of I.U.'s taken from the oral narratives of the "pear"
film, provided to show the composition of a typical I.U.
(3) jiù shì yǒu yīge rén ...
then be have oneCL person
Then there was a person.
tā zài zhāi lízi ba...
he PRO pick pear PRT
He was picking pears (I think/suppose)...
tā hěn mài lì de zhāi...
he very enthusiastic DE pick
He picked very enthusiastically...
tiān qí kān qǐ lái hǎo xiàng mǎn rè de ...(D-O)
weather appeared like quite hot DE
The weather appeared to be quite hot...

(4) jiǎng jiù shì yīge nóngfū hěn xīnkǔ a...
speak then be oneCL farmer very hardworking PRT
There was a farmer working very hard...
zhāi nàxiē dōngxi...
pick those things
picking those things...
hěn nán...
very difficult
(it) was very difficult...
hěn jiǔ le cái zhāidào yī lán shuǐguǒ...(C-O)
very long ASP then pick-complete one basket fruit
only after a long time did (he) pick one basketful of fruit...
Both of these series of I.U.'s appear sequentially in two of the oral narratives. We also point out that they conform to Chafe's three criteria of intonation, pausing, and syntax.

The examples below are typical of the I.U.'s produced in the written narratives. In many cases they represent complete sentences and other times a string of I.U.'s that make up a complete sentence. Commas are placed where the informants placed them. A break but with no comma indicates one complete I.U.

(5)  Zhèi shí,
    this time
    At this time,
    yīge nánghái,
    oneCl male-child
    a boy,
    dàyuē shì tāde ěrzi,
    probably is heDE son
    probably his son,
    qízhe zìxíngchē láidào guǒyuán.(A-W)
    rideZHE bicycle come-arrive orchard
    came into the orchard riding a bicycle.

(6)  Tā shíqǐ cáo mào qù huángěi xiǎo nánghái.
    he pick up grass hat go return-give small male-child
    He picked up the grass hat and returned it to the little boy.
Xiao nanhai hen gansie zheisange bangzhu tai de bu xiangshi de pengyou,
small male-child very thank those threeCL help heDE not mutual-know DE friend
The little boy was very thankful to the three boys, who he didn't know, that helped him,
jiu cong kuangzi l'i niale sange li gei tamen.(E-W)
then from basket inside takeLE threeCL pear give them
and took three pears from the basket and gave-them to them.

It also should be noted here that the notion of sentence in English is not always the same as
in Chinese. It is not uncommon for Chinese "sentences" to be rather long, and often
translate into English as several sentences. Tsao (1990) has effectively pointed this fact out
in his discussion of topic chain in Chinese. In Chinese it is common to state a single topic
in the S-initial position of a clause and follow it with a number of further clauses that all
refer back to the initial topic. These types of sentences often contain numerous clauses that
are difficult to translate into a single coherent sentence in English. For this reason Tsao
defines sentence in Chinese as a topic chain.

Table 1 below shows the length of each of the informants' oral and written
narratives, given in characters, L.U.'s (for both spoken and written) and in sentences (for
written). Speakers, or informants, are assigned a letter number. For example, for
informant A, his oral narrative was 539 characters long; his written narrative was 334
characters long; his oral narrative contained 52 L.U.'s, his written narrative 36, comprised
of 22 sentences.
Table 2: Length of narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>characters</th>
<th>I.U.'s</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>852</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>5905</td>
<td>3369</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average per narrative:</td>
<td>590.5</td>
<td>336.9</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this data we see that, in characters, the oral narratives are an average of 1.75 times longer than the written narratives; in I.U.'s the oral narratives are 1.72 times longer than the written narratives, and comparing I.U.'s in the oral narratives with sentences in the written narratives, the oral narratives are an average of 3.1 times longer. This information is in agreement with other languages, as mentioned above. In light of this, it is significant to note that oral narratives in Chinese are significantly longer than written narratives.

The reason why oral narratives are longer than written narratives is in part due to the unique characteristics of oral discourse. Because a person is creating the narrative on-the-spot, there is a certain amount of "thinking aloud" which takes the form of false starts,
self-corrections, rewording, and so forth that understandably add length to the narrative. When writing, an individual has time to think, ponder, analyze the structure, and then after this preparation, produce the narrative. Even after the narrative has been produced the writer has the option to go back and make corrections, reword, and so on. This process allows for a smoother, better organized, more coherent, and ultimately more succinct narrative. As Chafe (1982), Tannen (1982a & b), and others have pointed out, written texts are syntactically more complex due to their compact and terse nature. In that written Chinese has evolved from literary Chinese which has in turn evolved from Classical Chinese, it has inherited many of the features of its predecessor. Literary Chinese is syntactically compact and terse. In fact, the beauty of literary Chinese lies in its terseness and economy of words where imagery and dense illusions allowed for vivid descriptions with a minimal amount of words and syntactic marking. As we will see later in this chapter, explicit syntactic marking, such as the third-person pronoun, and aspect are not as productive in written Chinese as in oral Chinese. There is no doubt that this evolution of the Chinese written language plays a role in the character of written discourse.

3.4 Length of Idea Units

In addition to the overall length of the narratives, it is also important to analyze the length of each I.U. Because of the difficulty in determining exactly what constitutes a word in Chinese it was decided to give a count of the number of characters instead. This problem of counting words becomes difficult when you encounter such characters in Chinese that function as aspect markers, resultative verb suffixes, classifiers, and so on. It is felt that a character count will provide an accurate and just as revealing analysis of the length of I.U.'s. Table 3 below, shows the average number of characters that appeared in each of the oral and written I.U.'s as well as sentences for the written narratives. In other
words, the total number of characters in each narrative was divided by the number of I.U.'s in each narrative. The resulting number gives the average number of characters per I.U.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Oral I.U.'s</th>
<th>Written I.U.'s</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average length of I.U. in the oral narratives was 10.2 characters, and the average length of I.U. in the written narratives was 10.02 characters. Sentences in the written narratives averaged 17.9 characters. It was surprising to find that the average number of characters per I.U. was basically the same for both oral and written narratives. This finding was in contrast to studies of other languages mentioned in Chapter Two.
Simply looking at the narratives themselves one is given the impression that the I.U.'s the written narratives are much longer. As mentioned above, there was a tendency for I.U.'s in the written narratives to be synonymous with the sentence. In this regard, there were a number of I.U.'s in the written narratives that were quite long, as long as thirty or so characters. I.U.'s that long in the oral narratives were very rare.

There are various reasons as to why this ratio of I.U. length was so comparable between the oral and written narratives. Tannen (1982a) has suggested that all narrative, whether spoken or written, is based on an oral storytelling model. She suggested that speakers were more comfortable producing a narrative for an uncertain purpose than were writers because they felt that the context (i.e. telling a story) was readily clear. Writers, on the other hand, were less comfortable because they felt that they had to create a narrative stance or footing which put constraints on them. in addition to the natural tendency to economize words in writing, this is probably one of the reasons that the written narratives in this study were markedly shorter than the oral narratives. The instructions given to the informants was intentionally vague so as to allow the speaker or writer the flexibility to create the narrative without external constraints. It was also important that the informants were given the same task for both the oral and written component of the experiment.

Another possible reason why the I.U.'s were similar in length also relates to the genre being produced, i.e. narrative. When producing a written narrative it is highly likely that the writer had the reader in mind when writing and thus added sufficient punctuation marking so the reader would not have any trouble following the storyline. Being that narrative is based on an oral model, as Tannen has suggested, this strategy would confirm our findings. Indeed, other genres of discourse, such as more formal types of writing tend to have longer I.U.'s. Chafe and Danielwicz (1987) report that academic papers have the most words per I.U. To check this against the Chinese data, I did a random survey of an
academic book, Zhu Dexi's (1982) _Yufa Jiangyi_. Several paragraphs were selected in various parts of the book and the number of characters in each I.U. were tabulated, then divided by the total number of I.U.'s. Though not a very precise measure, it did give us a general feel for formal writing. From this survey we found the average number of characters in an I.U. to be 14.63. In addition to this it is interesting to note that it was not uncommon to see I.U.'s as long as forty characters, with I.U.'s of twenty to thirty characters being fairly common. These results compare favorably with Chafe and Denielwize's results of their analysis of English.

Let us now look at some examples of oral I.U.'s and compare them with their corresponding sentences in the written narratives to get a feel for the succinctness of the written narratives and the somewhat loose organization of the oral narratives. The three dots after each I.U. indicates a pause and the transition from one I.U. to another. It should be noted that there has been no attempt to measure the length of pauses in this study. The three dots, as indicated, may indicate a short, or a long pause. Whatever the length of the pause, however, it is sufficiently long and had a falling intonation to effectively mark the end of an I.U.

(7) **Nèige diànyǐng ah...**

that GE movie PRT

That movie ...

hǎo xiàng shì...

very similar is

... seemed to be...
yīge shòuhuò de jìjié...
one GE harvest DE seasonal
... a seasonal harvest...
yīge mòxīgē de yīge...
one GE Mexican DE one GE
a Mexican, a...
yīge jìjié gōng...
one GE seasonal worker
a seasonal worker...
zài nàr cǎi nèi ge...
at there pick that GE
there picking those...
zài shù shàng...
at tree top
in the tree...
cǎi lízi.(E-O)
pick pear
picking pears

In this oral narrative we see that the speaker used eight I.U.'s to describe a single event. Notice that the length of each I.U. is relatively short and that they are conjoined together to make a longer, more complex albeit somewhat disjointed, statement. Now look at the same description of this event as produced by the same informant in her written narrative.
We immediately recognize that the statement represented in (8) above, is much more succinct and compact than the series of I.U.'s that appeared in the oral version, in number (7). In (7) the I.U.'s tend to be rather short in length, whereas the written I.U.'s contain more information and are better organized. In this regard, the oral version contained eight I.U.'s while the written version only required two I.U.'s to convey the same information.

Chafe and Danielwicz (1987) have suggested that I.U.'s in spoken discourse are limited in size by the short-term memory or focal conscious capacity of the speaker. Chafe also notes that an I.U. in spoken discourse represents a single idea and he alludes to the fact the speakers can generally only talk about and comprehend one idea at a time. The difference in processing constraints mentioned above is also responsible. A writer has time to organize a series of ideas into a more complex and complete whole.

As we saw from the examples analyzed above, in the oral version, each I.U. contained one individual idea, whereas in the written version more than one idea was presented in an I.U.

In sum, it appears that similar strategies were employed by the informants when creating the oral and written narratives. Though the written narratives were shorter, better organized, and more succinct, the individual components (I.U.'s) that comprised the
narrative were similar in length. Despite this similarity it is interesting to note the many differences that exist between the two modes of discourse that will be discussed below.

3.5 Amount of Detail in Narratives

Oral narratives were not only longer but also contained a great deal more detail than the written narratives. Incidentally this is one of the reasons they tended to be longer. The example below effectively illustrates this difference. (9) is from an oral narrative and (10) is from the corresponding written narrative.

(9) tā jiù shì . . .
  he then is
  He then is/was
pá zài shù shàng . . .
climb in tree above
climbed up into the tree . . .
bǎ zhāihǎo de zhǎnshí de xiān fàng zài tā de shēn shàng de dōudou . . .
BA pick-complete DE temporarily DE first place in his DE body on-top-of DE pocket-pocket
took the picked (fruit) and first temporarily put it into the pocket
around his waist...
ránhòu zài shōují dào lǒu zi lǐmiàn . . . (D-O)
after in gather to basket inside
Then (he) gathered the (fruit) into the basket.
(10) tā bǎ zhāihǎo de shōují zài dìshāng de lánzǐ
nèi.(D-W)
he BA pick-complete DE gather on ground DE basket
within
He took the (fruit) and put it into the basket on the ground.

We see that the oral narrative (9) includes more information than the written narrative (10). (9) includes the information that he climbed into the tree, that he temporarily put the fruit in the pouch around his waist, and then that he put what he had gathered into the basket. (10) only indicates that he puts the fruit that has been picked into the basket.

The example below provides another case of the amount of detail used in an oral narrative that was left out in the written narrative.

(11) jiéguǒ tā de jiǎotāchē pēngdào yīge shítou...
thereupon, his DE bicycle hit-complete oneCL rock
Thereupon, his bicycle hit a rock...
tā dìdǎo le...
he fall-complete LE
he fell down...
lízi sǎn zài, quánbù de...
pear scatter on all DE
the pears scattered on, all of them...
mǎn zài dì shàng...(B-O)
full on ground top
all on the ground.
(12) 小男孩回头一看，碰到一只石头，
(12) died down LE
The small boy turned and glanced, then hit a rock, and fell down.

In the oral narrative above, we see that the informant provides more information than she did in her written narrative. In the oral version she tells us that after the boy hit the rock and fell down, the pears also fell and scattered all over the ground. The written version simply says that the boy hit the rock and fell down. Later in the written narrative the reader learns that the pears were also scattered when she writes that the three boys help him pick them up. This later mentioning perhaps suggests that the writer assumed that the reader would know that when the bike fell, the pears also would fall.

The feature of conciseness and succinct written narratives seems to have evolved from traditional written discourse in Chinese in a general sense. It seems that in an attempt to be concise writers elect to leave out some details. This is certainly due to the influence of thousands of years of Classical and literary Chinese discourse that were very terse and concise as was mentioned above. We also cannot rule out other possibilities. The fact that the written portion of the experiment came after the oral part may have been a contributing factor. It is possible that the informants were anxious to finish writing and thus wrote a more concise, and therefore shorter narrative. The fact that the creation of their written narrative took place later than the oral narrative may also indicate that they perhaps forgot some of the details. On the other hand, since the informants had already created one narrative, they had more time to think about the story and rehearse in their mind the events
that were portrayed. In this light it would seem that there would be more detail in the later narrative.

Rather than speculate on what might have happened had the experiment been different I will attempt to explain the reasons why the results of this experiment turned out the way they did.

The first thing to consider is that writing is a more cumbersome and time-consuming process than speaking. While an oral narrative might take five or so minutes to produce, a comparable written narrative takes many times longer to complete. In this context, informants were speaking spontaneously and in an informal context. When a person writes, no matter what the formality level, be it an academic paper, or a casual letter, there is a conscious effort to produce a text that is as free of errors and as well organized as possible. Even spontaneous informal writing tends to be better organized and error-free than its oral counterpart. Because this process is more time-consuming, it is likely that informants sacrificed some detail in order to produce a cleaner narrative in a time that they felt was appropriate for the task requested.

There is also a tendency in writing to not waste words and not include unnecessary details. When speaking there is a tendency to "ramble" and include a fair amount of unnecessary information. In all of the written narratives, the main storyline was preserved. In other words, there was sufficient detail to know the major events that occurred in the film. It is my feeling that those details that were left out of the written narratives were considered by the writers as unnecessary additions, and not crucial to the narrative. In an attempt to produce a narrative that was true to the film, the writers fulfilled their task.

Detail in the spoken narratives can be attributed to the fact that speaking is faster, thus more information can be given in a shorter time. Speakers are also more inclined to
reveal their thought process while they are speaking (so as to avoid lengthy pauses), which often translates into more minute details about the story.

3.6 Narrative vs. Evaluative I.U.'s

When narrating a series of events, there is a clear distinction between stating the facts of the event or action and that of commenting or evaluating what occurred or why. Some narrators stick to the facts and relate a series of events as if it were an objective news story. On the other hand, some narrators like to add comments of their own, such as speculating as to why something happened, or their feelings about certain events, or what will happen later. Along these lines are comments concerning what the narrator thinks of the situation. In the case of narrating the events in the "pear" film, some narrators also commented on the portrayal of the characters or other physical features of the film itself, such as camera angle, and so forth. These are all considered to be evaluative clauses or I.U.'s and not strictly narrative. Being that we are dealing with the same genre of discourse, that is narrative, it was felt that finding out which of the subgenres, oral or written, produced the most evaluative expressions would provide valuable information in distinguishing the differences between oral and written narrative discourse. Tannen (1982b) has proposed that there is a great deal more interpretation or evaluation in spoken texts than in written texts. She suggests that interpretation is a way of acknowledging the interpersonal involvement of the speaker and hearer. This phenomenon can also be accounted for in Chafe's notion of involvement. Our Chinese data confirms Tannen's claims.

These numbers were generated from the data by examining each I.U. in each of the narratives, both oral and written. Each I.U. was then assigned as being either narrative or evaluative in nature. The total number of evaluative and narrative I.U.'s were then tabulated
and given a percentage according to the total number of I.U.'s in a given narrative. Percentages were rounded to the nearest tenth. Before we look at the chart, several examples of typical narrative and evaluative expressions are provided below. We first look at some narrative expressions.

(13) Tā yòng tīzi pádào shù shàng qu zhāi lízi. (A-O)
he use ladder climb-arrive tree top go pick pear
He used a ladder to climb up into the tree to pick pears.

(14) Zhènghǎo nèibiān yǒu lái le yīge nǚ de yě qízhe yǐliàng chē. (E-O)
just then there again come LE oneGE girl DE also ride-ZHE oneCL bike
Just then a girl, also riding a bike, came from that side.

(15) Měi yīge rén shǒu lǐ nále yīge lízi zài kěn. (G-O)
each one-GE person hand inside grasp LE one-GE pear ZAI bite
Each person held a pear in his hand biting it.

(16) Yǒu yīge mùrén qiān le yǐzhǐ yáng jīngguo shù xià. (G-W)
have oneCL shepherd lead LE oneCL goat pass tree below
A shepherd lead a goat past below the tree.
(17) \( \text{Nèi sānge xiǎo hái bāng tā shōushí guǒzǐ.} \) \( \text{(H-W)} \)
those three-CL small child help him pick up fruit
Those three kids helped him pick up the fruit

The above examples are typical of a narrative I.U. both oral and written. There are no comments or attempts to interpret the events; rather, they just state the facts. In contrast, the examples below are evaluative I.U.'s.

(18) \( \text{Wǒ xiǎnggān tā dàgài rènwei zhè jīge xiǎo háizī tōule tāde shuǐguǒ,} \) \( \text{(C-O)} \)
I think he probably know these few small child stealLE his DE fruit
I think he probably knew that these kids stole his fruit.

(19) \( \text{shídīǎn zhōng zuǒyòu zhěnmo hùī niǎo jiào ne?} \)
ten point clock approximately how can bird call PRT
How is it that a bird would be singing at around 10 o'clock?
\( \text{yǒu diǎn qíguài.} \) \( \text{(E-O)} \)
have little strange
It's a little strange.

(20) \( \text{Dàgài shì yùn wǎng yīge cāngkù.} \) \( \text{(A-W)} \)
probably is transport to oneCL warehouse
(He) is probably taking it to a warehouse.
We see from these evaluative I.U.'s a different perspective than with the narrative I.U.'s. (18) provides a speculation about what the narrator thinks the character knows. In (19) the narrator comments on what time of day she thinks the events happened. She feels it is strange that even though it is supposed to be late morning there is still a bird singing. In (20) the narrator speculates as to where he thinks the kid will take the basket of fruit. In each of these cases the narrator has deviated from stating the facts and has provided additional information that was not directly portrayed in the movie.

The variation and distribution of these strategies can be observed in the table below. In the Table, the first number is the number of I.U.'s in that narrative, and the second is the percentage of the total I.U.'s in the narrative according to the numbers in Table 1. For example, for informant C, 18 or 41% of his I.U.'s were evaluative in nature and in the corresponding written narrative, there were zero evaluative I.U.'s. This shows a vast contrast.
Table 4: Narrative vs. Evaluative I.U.'s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>ORAL</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Ev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>46/88.5%</td>
<td>6/11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>37/92.5%</td>
<td>3/7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>26/59%</td>
<td>18/41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25/96%</td>
<td>1/4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>52/79%</td>
<td>14/21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>70/97%</td>
<td>2/3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>78/97.5%</td>
<td>2/2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>67/70.5%</td>
<td>28/29.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>49/89%</td>
<td>6/11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>45/96%</td>
<td>2/4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the oral narratives we see a relatively high proportion of I.U.'s that occur are evaluative in nature. On the average, 86% of the I.U.'s in the oral narratives were narrative in nature and 14% were evaluative. The highest percent was with informant C with 41% evaluative I.U.'s. The low was with informant G with 2.5% evaluative I.U.'s. Though these do not seem to be very large numbers, they are quite significant when compared to the averages for the written I.U.'s. In the written narratives 98% of all I.U.'s were narrative in nature and only 2% were evaluative. In fact, of 336 total I.U.'s in the ten written narratives, only 6 were evaluative. The highest percentage was only 6% with informant A. This high is still less than half of the 14% average for the oral narratives. Six of the informants provided no evaluative comments in their written narratives.
Because oral narration involves another individual it is most likely that use of evaluative expressions stems from this communicative relationship as Tannen has suggested. Even though the narrator is producing a monologue, the fact that there is another person who has initiated the discourse seems to give rise to interpretation and speculation of the events in the film. We also point to the fact mentioned earlier that providing evaluative information may be another device to keep the flow of the narration and to avoid long pauses. This phenomenon, again, supports Chafe's notion of involvement. When writing a narrative, on the other hand, there is no other person to directly communicate with at the time of writing and thus the need to evaluate diminishes drastically. Time constraints and other writing strategies discussed above may also be factors.

It is worth mentioning again that the procedure used in this experiment certainly influenced the results. If another procedure were followed we may have come up with different conclusions. The results here reflect the procedure used inherent with its strengths and weaknesses.

3.7 Lexical Variation

Lexical variation is also prevalent between oral and written discourse in these "pear" film narrations. Just as it is true that we do not write the same way that we speak, we likewise use different words when we write than when we speak. Some words are only used in writing and would sound too formal, and out of place if we used them in speech. Likewise, much of what we say is too informal and casual to appear in written form, except perhaps in the most informal of written discourse genres, such as notes, post cards, etc. Lexical variation ranges from "literary" words used in the written narratives to the choice of
coordinators used in each of the narratives. This notion of lexical variation is supported by Chafe and Danielwicz (1987), Halliday (1987), and Beaman (1982).

We will first look at the different coordinating words used in each of the genres of discourse. We will follow this up by discussing literary words that showed up exclusively in the written narratives.

3.7.1 Coordination

There was a considerable difference in the use of coordinators between the two genres of narration. By coordinators we mean words or expressions used to conjoin two clauses or phrases (I.U.’s) Oftentimes they also function to begin a new utterance or to shift to a new topic. In English the most common coordinators are and, or, and but. In the oral narratives the following coordinators were used extensively.

(21) ránhòu then; after that
    hòulái afterwards; then

Ránhòu was by far the most productive coordinator with it occurring as many as 32 times in H’s oral narrative. Other coordinators that occurred regularly in the oral narratives but not as frequently as ránhòu and hòulái were:

(22) jiéguǒ result; outcome; (can also be used to mean "then")
    érqíě and also; moreover
    zhèi(ge) shíhòu at this time
    jiù then.
All the coordinators in (22) occurred regularly throughout the oral narratives. Typical strategies of coordination are illustrated in (23), (24), and (25) below:

(23) **ránhòu** tā jiù juéde yǒu diǎn tòng...
then he then feel have little pain
Then he felt a little pain...

**ránhòu** tā jiù pǎi tāde jiǎo...
then he then pat his-DE foot
Then he patted his foot...

**ránhòu** yǒu sāngè... (H-0)
then have three
Then there were three...

(24) ...lā lízi sònggěi nà xiǎo háizi...
pull pear give that small child
...took the pears and gave them to that small boy...

**jiéguǒ** nà xiǎo háizi jīngguo nàkē lízi shù de shíhòu... (C-0)
result that small child passed by thatCL pear tree DE time
then as that small boy passed by the pear tree...
(25) **hòulái tāmen yě shùnbiàn yī rén ná yīkē biān zǒu biān chǐ...**

afterwards, they also incidentally one person take oneCL as walk as eat..
Then they happened to each be holding a (pear) and eating them as they walked...

**ránhòu wàng huítóu lù shàng zǒu...**(D-0)

afterward toward turn around road above go...
then (they) turned around and left.

The strategy of using coordinators in this manner is fairly common in oral discourse. The coordinators discussed above are similar to the two very common English connectives *and* and *then*. These types of coordinators are necessary to link the short I.U.'s together and to bring some continuity to the narration.

In the written narratives, coordinators were not very prevalent. In most cases, complete and syntactically complex sentences were not linked with coordinators per se, but rather they flowed together like ordinary written discourse usually does. The one exception was the use of **zhèshí**, *at this time*. This coordination device was used occasionally in the written narratives with a high of four times in narrative A. Coordinators of this type are probably more common in written narratives than in other types of written discourse due to the sequential nature of the events in narratives. The example below illustrates the use of this coordinator.

(26) **Lí sǎn luò yī dì.**

pear scatter down one ground
The pears scattered onto the ground.
Zhēishí cóng shù yǐn xià guò lái sān gè háizi, liǎng gè nán hái, yī gé nǚ hái. (A-W)

at this time from tree shade under cross come three CL child, two CL male child, one CL female child

Then, from under the shade of a tree, three kids, two boys and one girl came over.

Coordination also plays a role in the temporal sequencing of the narrative. As we have seen, oral narratives are more closely linked to a temporal ordering. As the aspect system in Mandarin plays a role in the temporal sequencing of clauses in Chinese discourse this topic will be discussed in Chapter Four.

3.7.2 Literary Vocabulary

The written narratives displayed certain words that are typically absent in speech. Even in an informal situation, such as narrating a sequence of events, these literary words still showed up. The most common of these words was the word biàn which has a similar function to the spoken jiǔ meaning then. Others included wú to not have; yú in, at, on, yúshī thereupon, cǐ this, and yǔ a literary Chinese term meaning to give. The citations below show these words in context and are underlined. (The citations below are excerpts and are not the complete sentences that appear in the narratives).
(27) Nà tōu lǐ xiǎohái yú lùshàng bùqiǎo hé lìng yī qí chē xiǎo nǚhái...(D-W)
that steal pear little child on road top not-clever and another one ride bike little girl child...
That little kid who stole the pears, with another little girl riding a bike on the road, un cleverly...

(28) Nèi sān gè nán háizi kànle yī xià, biàn bāngzhù tā...(C-W)
those three-CL boy child see ASP one moment, then help him
Those three boys looked for a moment, then helped him...

(29) yǔshí tā jīxù tuīzhe chēzi...(A-W)
thereupon he continue push-ASP bike
Thereupon he continued to push the bike...

(30) hòulái, yǒu yī shàonián qí dāncē chūcháng, wú yōulù...(I-W)
afterwards have one young kid ride bike out-field, not have worry
Afterwards, a small kid rode a bike out of the field, unconcerned...
(31) sònɡ lè sān ē guǒzǐ yǔ zhèi wèi ná pīnɡ pānɡ pāi de nán hái zuò wèi chónɡ xiè. (H-W)

giveLE threeCL fruit give thisCL hold paddle ball
DE male child action thank (by giving sth. as a reward)
... gave three pieces of fruit to the boy holding the paddle ball to thank him.

(32) Cǐshí zhèng shì shǎnɡwù...(E-W)

this-time precise is morning
At this time it was morning.

We should also mention that chónɡ xiè in (31) is also a rather formal term that is not
generally used in speech.

In written Chinese discourse there is a tendency to abbreviate whenever possible so
as to make the narrative more concise. This was observed on several occasions. (33) and
(34) below provide examples of this discourse strategy.

(33) sān xiǎo zǐ...(I-W)

three small person
...three kids...

(34) tāmen sān rén...(G-W)

they three person
...the three boys...

(33) illustrates an abbreviated way to refer to sān ē xiǎo háizi or three small kids.
(34) is an abbreviation of tāmen sān ē rén or the three of them. These clauses have
deleted the classifier ge. Another good example of this type of conservative use of words is clearly illustrated below.

(35) Shào nián kuīshì, yī bù liúshēn fēng chuī lái, mào luò dì. (I-W)
    few-year peek at one not pay attention to wind blow come
    hat drop ground
    (When) the boy peeked, at the moment he wasn't paying attention the wind blew, and his hat fell to the ground.

In (35) we see this conciseness particularly in the phrase mào luò dì, which is a condensed version of the more colloquial màozi luò zài dìshàng.

This tendency toward terseness can again be explained by the influence of Classical and literary Chinese on the modern written language. For many literate Chinese, the more terse and Classical-like your writing is, the more beautiful it is. Whereas written Chinese discourse uses these types of abbreviations and terseness, it is uncommon in oral narrative discourse to do so. This is one other small feature that gives written Chinese discourse its syntactic complexity.

3.8 Syntactic Variation

In this section we will first point out some general syntactic features that indicate that written narratives are syntactically more complex than their oral counterparts. We will then look closely at anaphoric relations in the discourse texts. This will be followed by a discussion of modification with the possessive marker de in Mandarin. Finally we will end this section with a brief discussion of temporal sequence in the narratives.
The notion of syntactic complexity has been touched upon in the sections above. The first and most obvious difference that we observe between oral and written narratives is the overall complexity of the I.U.'s. In the oral narratives we saw that the I.U.'s were typically short, simple phrases. Examples (36) and (37) below are repeated from (3) and (7) respectively.

(36)  jiù shì yǒu yīge rén ...
   then  be  have oneCL person
   Then there was a person.
   tā zài zhāi lǐzǐ ba...
   he PRO pick pear PRT
   He was picking pears (I think)
   tā hěn mǎilì de zhāi...
   he very enthusiastic DE pick
   He picked very enthusiastically
   tiānqì kànqǐlái hǎo xiàng mǎn rè de...(D-O)
   weather appeared  like  quite hot DE
   The weather appeared to be quite hot.

(37)  Nèige diànyìng ah...
   that GE movie PRT
   That movie...
   hǎo xiàng shí...
   very  similar  is
   ... seemed to be...
We observe in these examples that I.U.'s from the oral narratives are short, and syntactically simple. In many cases I.U.'s from the oral narratives consist of a simple noun phrase like: yīge jìjié gōng or a simple verb-object clause like: cǎi lízi. There is a noticeable lack of more complex constructions like the bèi construction, common subordination type sentences such as: yīnweī...suóyí, or suírán...kěshì, complex DE modification, and so forth.
The written narratives, on the other hand, were similar to Chafe's and others observations that written discourse utilizes more complex syntax. The fact that many of the I.U.'s in the written narratives are longer also inherently allows them to exhibit more complex syntactic structures. Unlike the oral narratives where the narration was sometimes disjointed and pieced together, for the most part the written narratives read smoothly, are coherent, and well organized. The very nature of a spontaneous oral narration immediately dispenses with much of the forethought and subsequent organization that is typical of other genres of written discourse. It is interesting to note that even though the written narratives in this experiment were also spontaneous and unplanned just like the oral narratives, they nevertheless resembled planned organized discourse typical of written discourse. This is no doubt due to the fact that writers had time to think, plan, and prepare what they were going to write before they did so. In some of the written narratives there was some evidence of spontaneity and slight disorganization but for the most part they all read rather well. With no time limit inhibiting the writers they had more time to produce a more polished narrative. Some of the informants even did some minor editing. One might wonder why the written narratives are shorter when the writers had more time to write them. As mentioned above, writers are more concerned with a well-organized text than with including painstaking detail. The extra time spent writing was most likely spent thinking and planning than with recalling every detail of the film.

Spontaneous oral discourse lacks this preparation time. Chafe's notion of involvement becomes an immediate factor in the production of the oral narrative. In natural conversation silence is generally awkward and to be avoided. Long pauses in speech are oftentimes interpreted by the listener in a variety of negative ways such as nervousness, slowness, unsophistication, and even stupidity on the part of the speaker. For these reasons there is more pressure to speak steadily and as fluidly as possible even if that
means producing false starts or repeating oneself in order to regain one's train of thought or
to think of what to say next.

The written narratives, on the other hand, were more compact and syntactically
complex. The examples below illustrate these features of written discourse.

(38) Dāng tā kànjiàn zhāi lǐ de rén, bìng méi yǒu
fāxiàn tā shí, tā jiù lái xùnsù de fàng xià chēzi,
jiāng lǐ zhuāng shàng chē, cōngcōngmángmáng de
pǎo le. (J-W)
when he saw pick pear DE person, moreover not discover him at that
time, he then come quickly DE place down bike, take pear pack on top of
bike, hastily DE run ASP
When he saw the pear picker, and noticing that the pear picker had not
discovered him, he quickly laid his bike down, packed the pears on his
bike, and hastily rode off.

In (38) we see a rather complex set of I.U.'s that comprise a single sentence; at least it is
complex compared to the I.U.'s typical of the oral narratives. The sentence can be broken
up into two parts: the first part consists of the first two clauses that set up the situation, and
the second part the last three clauses which are make up a topic chain describing the events.
We also notice that the sentence in (38) flows smoothly and coherently. Furthermore, we
see that there are no coordinators marking the relationship between the three subordinate
clauses. Rather, they are linked together through their relationship with the first two initial
clauses: Dāng tā kànjiàn zhāi lǐ de rén, bìng méi yǒu fāxiàn tā
shi.
The oral version of this sentence is below:

(39) Guòlái kǎndào zhǎi lǐ de rén zài méiyǒu zhùyì tā...

come over saw pick pear DE person at not pay attention him

HE came over and saw that the pear picker did not notice him...

tā jiù kuàisù de bā tā chēzi fāng xià...

he then quickly DE take his bike place down

He then quickly put his bike down....

ránhòu ne, bā nà yī ge dà kuāng lǐ fàngdào zǐjǐ de chē shàng

then PRT, take that one CL big basket pear place own DE bike on top of

Then he took the large basket of pears and put it on his bike...

jiù zǒu le...

then go PRT

(He) then left...

qí chē jiù zǒu le.(J-O)

ride bike then go PRT

(He) then rode off on his bike.

We see that this oral narration, produced by the same informant, contains several I.U.'s (5) to relate the same information that was in one sentence in the written narrative. Even though the written narrative sample was also composed of five I.U.'s, they worked together to make a tight cohesive unit, unlike the oral narrative sample. The I.U.'s or clauses are linked together into a group of independent utterances that together make a larger complete
unit. In the written version the events are tightly linked together through the syntax of the sentence and form a topic chain. But the oral version uses five rather simple clauses to convey the same thing.

The oral narratives typically consist of short, single clauses that rely heavily on coordinated structures to provide cohesion and to show relationships. The written narratives, on the other hand, use longer sentences and more subordinate clauses which combine to make a more syntactically compact structure. This process, topic chaining, was found to be relatively common in the written narratives.

It is prudent here to point out our findings related to coordination discussed earlier. The use of coordinating words are also related to syntactic complexity in that they dictate how I.U.'s are linked together. In the oral narratives we found short, simple clauses linked together with an abundance of coordinators. In the written narratives I.U.'s tended to be longer, with very few coordinators. These I.U.'s did not depend on coordinators to link them together as their components were linked internally by way of subordination and other syntactic devises.

### 3.8.1 Third-Person Pronouns and Zero Anaphora

In their paper "Third-Person Pronouns and Zero Anaphora in Chinese Discourse" Li and Thompson (1979) have shown that in vernacular Chinese fiction\(^1\) zero anaphora is very productive, so much so that the insertion of the third-person pronoun is considered the exception to the rule. They state:

...zero anaphora is widespread in Chinese discourse, so much so, in fact, that the nonoccurrence of anaphoric arguments in discourse must be regarded as the normal, unmarked situation. Thus, it is the OCCURRENCE of pronouns in Chinese discourse that must be explained" (1979: 322).

---

\(^1\)Their data was taken from the two Qing Dynasty novels Shuǐ Hú Zhuàn and Rǔ Lín Wài Shǐ.
It must be kept in mind however, that Li and Thompson's paper only dealt with written narrative discourse, and in their study they only analyzed vernacular fiction, which, being fiction, is noticeably different than spontaneous written narratives.

Li and Thompson (322) accurately observe the true nature of third-person pronouns and zero anaphora when they state:

One's initial impression in looking at Chinese narrative discourse is that, in most positions where a full pronoun appears, it could be replaced by a zero-pronoun and it could just as well have appeared in the preceding or following clause as in the clause where it does appear.

This impression can be applied to both written and spoken narratives. Predicting when and where the zero anaphora or third person pronoun appears is a more difficult matter. Li and Thompson came to the conclusion that it is a matter of personal preference. Even the written discourse data in this study differed from Li and Thompson's findings for marking of the third-person pronoun and the zero anaphora. This is no doubt due to the difference in the type of discourse analyzed. Furthermore, as we will see below, this grammatical feature also varied between the oral and the written narratives.

In Chinese, a pronoun always refers to a known referent, thus an NP must always precede a pronoun in discourse. When discussing anaphoric relations there are several features to consider. They are the referent, or noun phrase, which usually serves as the topic of the discourse and occurs in the subject position (pre-verbal). There are three possible ways to refer back to the NP identity: one, by repeating the NP, or a variation of it, two, a pronoun, and three, with zero anaphora. Zero anaphora is merely the deletion of either the NP or pronoun when the context is sufficiently clear. As Li and Thompson have pointed out, the strategy of using a zero anaphora is very common in Chinese, and is perfectly grammatical. Tsao (1990) observes that the subject is the most favorable position for either deletion. He also reports that the most common sequencing of anaphoric features
in discourse is: first the identity NP, followed by pronominalization, and finally with
deletion, (zero anaphora). According to this pear film data, this seems to be a very broad
generalization that we found was not always the case.

In our data it was found that the zero anaphora was quite common in both modes of
discourse, confirming Li and Thompson’s reports of its productivity. We also found that
pronominalization and NP repetition were also present in both the spoken and written
narratives but to different degrees. The positioning or sequencing of these various features
also varied between spoken and written discourse. We will first provide several examples
to clarify the different possible markings for anaphoric reference. Following those we will
discuss specific anaphoric strategies used in the oral and written narrative texts.

In the examples below we see that the zero anaphora is simply a blank spot where
the third-person pronoun, or a repetition of the NP could optionally appear. It is frequently
negated in discourse because context provides the necessary information to understand the
narrative. In such cases NP repetition or pronominalization may even appear redundant.
The concept has been common in written Chinese from very early times. One is reminded
of the ancient text Zuo Zhuan with its rampant use of the zero anaphora to the extent that
its terseness makes it difficult to follow, or at least know who is speaking at all times. The
frequent use of the zero anaphora in written Chinese narrative discourse also contributes to
Chafe’s notion of abstractness in that this feature gives the narrative a more abstract and
removed-from-the-reader feeling. In the examples of the use of zero anaphora below, the
symbol ø indicates the zero anaphora. NP referents and pronouns are underlined.
(40) 你有 一个 小男孩儿 骑 一列 车 再 从 另一个 方向 横穿过来。
Then there was another small boy that rode over from another direction on a
bicycle.

(41) 然后，这个时间 从 右边 再 一个 小男孩儿 骑 车 横穿过来。
Then, at this time a small boy rode his bicycle over from the right side.

Uh, the small boy passed by the three baskets under the tree, three
baskets...
zhòngjiān, tā jiù, běn lái xiǎng tōu yīge lízi. (G-O)
center, he then, originally want steal oneCL pear
In between (the baskets), he then, originally wanted to steal a pear.

(42) Yīge Mèxiān jījié gōng zài guǒyuán lǐ cǎi lí.
oneCL Mexican seasonal worker in orchard inside pick pear
There was a Mexican seasonal worker picking pears in an orchard.
Tā yòng tīzi dā zài shù shàng,
he use ladder put up in tree top
He put a ladder up into a tree,
ø pá shàng qu ø bā lí yīge ge zhāi xiàlái fàngdào
climb up go take pear oneCL CL pick down-come place-arrive
basket inside
(he) climbed up and picked the pears one by one and placed them in a
basket.

In (40) we saw the NP identity followed by three zero anaphoras. In (41) the NP was
mentioned, then repeated, followed by a pronoun, and in (42) we saw the NP followed
first by a pronoun, then by the zero anaphora. In our data we found a wide range of
sequencing of these anaphoric features.

One of the most striking features of the written narratives was the common use of
topic chaining (see Tsao 1990; Tai 1978; Li and Thompson 1981). Topic chaining is when
a single topic is mentioned and then a series of phrases follow that all begin with zero
anaphora, which refer back to the NP topic. The NP provides the identity and the context
dictates the relationship between the phrases that follow with that NP. (43) below provides a clear example of this strategy.

(43) **Nèi sānge nánhāizi** kànle yī xià, ə bian bāngzhù tā, ə fú tā qǐlái. ə hái bāng tā shíqǐ yī kuāngzi de lǐzi. ə Nònghǎole zhīhòu ə biān yào lǐkāi.(C-W)
those threeCl male-child seeLE one down ə then help ə support (with hand) him get up ə also help him pick-up one basket DE pear ə do-successLE after then ə want depart
Those three boys looked over, then (they) helped him. (They) helped him up. (They) also helped him pick up a basket of pears. After (they) did this (they) then wanted to leave.

(44) **Xiǎo nánhāi** suīrán diēdāole, dànshì tā bìng bù mányuàn, ə zhǐ shí pāi pāi hūichén, ə mò mò tuǐr. ə shǒushí guǒzi, ə tái tóu yī kàn, yǒu sānge háizi zài kàn tā.(H-W)
small male-child even though fallLE however he moreover not complain ə only is ə pat pat dust ə rub rub leg ə clean up pear ə raise head one look have threeCl child ZAI look him
Even though the small kid fell down, he didn't complain. (He) just patted away the dust, and (he) rubbed his leg. (He) cleaned up the pears, and (he) raised his head and saw three kids looking at him.
In these two examples we see that after the identity is mentioned (in the topic/subject position), the following references to that NP are either all zero anaphora, or pronominalization and zero anaphora. It is also worth pointing out that the zero anaphora in each of these clauses occurs in the subject position. This was the overwhelming trend in both the written and spoken narratives. This phenomenon was quite common in the written narratives but was rare in the spoken narratives. Though pronominalization was used in the written narratives it was much more common in the oral narratives. Li and Thompson (1979) also found these types of examples, with long topic chains with several zero anaphora, very common in vernacular literature. In these examples (41 and 42) the interpretation of the zero pronouns is dictated on the basis of pragmatic information provided by the context of the discourse and by our knowledge of the world. Li and Thompson have indicated that this is the fundamental strategy for interpreting the zero pronoun.

It was rare in the oral narratives to have long topic chains with the use of zero anaphora. The most common case was to state the referent (NP), then follow it with a zero anaphora, then either repeat the NP or use a pronoun. The examples below are typical of the oral narratives.

(45) Ránhòu zhèi xiǎo hái nále yī kuāng lí jiù wàng zìxíngchē de qiántou fāng...

after this small child takeLE one basket pear then toward bicycle DE front place

Then this small kid grabbed a basket of pears and put them on the front of his bicycle.
ø fàngdào zìxíngchē qiántou...
ø placeRVC bicycle front place
(He) placed it on the front of his bicycle.
zhèige rén jūrán yě méi zhùyīdào zhèi xiǎohái guòlái...
thisCL person surprisingly also not have pay attentionRVC this small child across-come
This person surprisingly didn't notice the small boy come over.
hòulái xiǎo hái qí chē...
after small child ride bike
Then, the small boy rode the bike...
ø qízhe chē ma...
rideZHE bike PRT
(He) was riding the bike.

(46) yǒu yīge lǎobān zhèngzài ta zìjǐ de zhuāng yuàn zhāi lí...
have oneCL old-board in process of his own DE village-courtyard pick pear
There was an old guy in his own village orchard picking pears.
ránhòu, ø xiǎoxīn yīyī de zhāile
then ø careful cautiously DE pickLE
Then, (he) carefully and cautiously picked...
tā zhāi lí...
he pick pear
he picked pears..
rán tā fāxiàn yǒu yīge lízi diàodào dìshàng le...
then he discover have oneCl pear fall-down ground-top LE
Then he discovered that a pear had fallen to the ground.
Tā jiù gěi tā shǐqǐlái...
he then give it pick-up
He then picked it up.
ránhòu jiěxià tā de scarf jiù gěi tā cāca
gānjìng...
then undo his DE scarf then give it wipe clean
Then he undid his scarf and wiped it clean.
ø zài jīngjīng de fàngdào kuāng lǐ...
ø again lightly DE place-in basket inside
(He) again placed it lightly it inside the basket.
ránhòu tā yòu huíqù zhāi tā de lí...(J-O)
then he again return-go pick his DE pear
Then he again returned to picking his pears.

In these two typical examples we see different patterns of NP marking, pronominalization, and zero marking. There seemed to be no set patterns in the oral narratives other than the fact that topic chains with multiple zero markings were rare. Also common in the oral narratives is the use of many pronouns, as (44) shows. Another common feature in the oral
narratives was to explicitly mark, with an NP, the main character in the story (the young boy who steals the pears). The example below illustrates this point.

(47) yǒu yīge jiù kànjiàn gāngcái nèige nánhái diào zài dìshàng de nèidǐng cǎo mào...
have oneCL then saw just then thatCL boy fall on ground DE thatCL hat

There was one that saw that boy’s hat that had just fallen on the ground.
tā...rènwéi zhèdìng cǎo mào yǐnggāi shì nèige qí chē de nánhái de...
he think thisCL grass hat should be thatCL ride bike DE boy DE

He...thought this straw hat should belong to the boy who rode the bike.
suǒyǐ tā chūile yǐshēng kǒushào...
therefore he blowLE oneCL whistle

Therefore he whistled.
ø è, dāge zhāohu gěi nèige nánhái...
ø uh, hitCL call give thatCL boy

Uh, (he) called the boy.
nèige nánhái tíngxìalái...(F-0)
thatCL boy stop-down-come

That boy stopped.

The reason for this frequent explicit mentioning of this main character is probably due to the fact that because the whole story revolves around him the speaker wants to make sure
the listener understands what he is doing at all times. The speaker is attempting to eliminate the potential for misunderstanding. NP repetition was not a frequent feature in the written narratives.

The use of pronouns in the oral narrative seems to give the narratives a more personal, and conversational-like flavor, and this is probably the main reason why it occurred so frequently. In this light it does not seem out of the ordinary that it is more productive than in the written narratives. Likewise, the infrequent use of pronouns and noun repetition in the written narratives resembles more literary writing, particularly literary Chinese. In oral discourse a listener usually only has one chance, maybe two, to listen to and understand the narrative. The brevity of the I.U.'s in the oral narratives which indicate a complete and relatively independent unit gives rise to more third-person pronoun marking and NP repetition.

In that zero pronoun marking was quite productive in both types of narratives confirms Li and Thompson's observations that is it a very productive feature in discourse. However, unlike Li and Thompson's study, it has been shown in this study that this is not only the case in written discourse but also in spoken discourse.

In this study we have also pointed out some variance with Li and Thompson's findings. We do agree that the use of the zero anaphora as well as the third-person pronoun seems to be random and determined by the personal preference of the speaker or author. Likewise, there seems to be no set pattern when to use it. Li and Thompson have stated that the use of the zero anaphora appears to be the normal, unmarked situation and thus the more common feature to use. However, our findings are contrary to their observation. In written narratives, pronominalization was used just as frequently as zero marking. This seems to indicate that rather than the zero anaphora being the normal marking and the use of the third-person pronoun being the exception, they both are productive in spontaneous
written narratives, and therefore both features should be considered standard for this type of discourse.

In the oral narratives a different picture emerges that is even more at variance with Li and Thompson's findings. In the oral narratives we found that the marked third-person pronoun combined with NP repetition was far more productive than the zero anaphora. This is undoubtedly due to the reasons that were discussed above. At this point, rather than dispute Li and Thompson's findings we wish to refine the observations they made by pointing out the fact that different genres of discourse have unique characteristics. It is not enough to simply make a distinction between oral discourse or written discourse. As we have shown, traditional vernacular fiction is markedly different than spontaneous written narratives with regard to the use of third-person pronouns and the zero anaphora. In light of this we feel that we have added to the knowledge of this grammatical feature to what Li and Thompson have already provided. The Table below gives a summary of anaphoric features found in our narrative discourse texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>more NP repetition</td>
<td>less NP repetition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more pronominalization</td>
<td>less pronominalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>productive zero anaphora</td>
<td>productive zero anaphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short topic chains</td>
<td>long topic chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP repetition for main character</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8.2 DE Modification

Modification by the possessive marker DE is a common feature in Chinese. When DE is used in these types of clauses Chao calls it explicit modification (1968: 285). Examples of this kind of modification would be dǎ qiú de rén, the person that hit the ball; or hēi yánse de gāngbǐ, a fountain pen that is black. In each of these clauses the information preceding DE modifies the noun or noun phrase that follows.

In keeping with our previous findings, that oral narratives generally contain relatively short and simple I.U.'s, it was also discovered that DE modification clauses in the oral narratives on the whole were quite short and simple. On the other hand, we discovered that the DE modification clauses in the written narratives tended to be much longer and more complex, as illustrated in (48) below. The underlined portion of the example indicates the attributive clause in this and subsequent examples in this section.

(48) Zhèishi guò lái sānge zài lù pánɡ wánshuá de xiǎo hái.(E-W)

this time across come threeCL on road side play DE small child

Then, along came three small kids who were playing around by the side of the road.

This sentence, from a written narrative, shows a relatively complex and long DE modification clause. The attributive clause in this example includes three distinct ideas. The first is three; the second, on the road side; and three, playing. These three concepts all modify the noun phrase small kids. If we look at the oral version of this narrative we find that no DE modification is used. The example below is from informant E's oral narrative.
(49) ránhòu, pángbiān yòu láile sānge xiǎo hái...(E-O)
    afterwards, side again comeLE threeCL small child
    Then, three small kids came from the side.

In this example the speaker chose simply to modify xiǎohái with the quantifier sānge.
Indeed, clauses with DE modification were not very common in the oral narratives. When
they did occur, they tended to be rather short and simple, such as:

(50) ...qí zìxíngchē de xiǎo nán hái...(J-O).
    ride bike DE small male child
    the small boy riding a bike...

(51) zhāi lì de nàwèi zhōng nián rén...(A-O)
    pick pear DE thatCL middle year person
    That middle-aged man picking pears...

The following are further examples of DE modification phrases from the written narratives
with their corresponding oral narrative versions.
xiǎo nán hái hěn gǎn xiè zhèi sāng e bāng zhu ta
de bù xīăng shí de pēng yōu ...(E-W)
small male child very grateful-thank these threeCL help him DE not know DE friend

The small boy was very grateful for the three boys, who he didn't know, that helped him.

Zhèi xiǎo hái hǎo xiàng hái shì tīng gǎn xiè tā
de...(E-O)
this small child very like still was rather grateful-thank him DE

The small boy seemed to be very grateful for him....

...sòng le sāng e guǒ zì yǔ zhèi wèi ná pīng pāng pāi de nán hái...(H-W)
giveLE threeCL fruit give thisCL hold paddle ball
DE male child

... gave three pears (fruit) to the boy holding the paddle ball.

Tā xiǎng gǎn xiè tāmen, suǒyǐ jiù gěi tāmen sānkē guǒ zì...
he want grateful thank them, therefore then give them
threeCL fruit

He wanted to thank them, therefore he gave them three pears (fruit)...
ránhòu nàge pīng pāng pāi de háizi jiù huí qùle...(H-O)

afterward thatCL paddle ball DE child then return goLE
then, the boy with the paddle ball returned...

(54) gānghǎo yíngmiàn zǒu láile zhèi sāngé chīzhe guǒzǐ de nán hái.(H-W)

just toward (them) walk comeLE this threeCL eatZHE
fruit DE male child
Just then the three boys eating fruit walked toward (him).
Zhèige shíhou gānghǎo nà sāngé háizi yīmìàn chīzhe guǒzǐ, yīmìàn zǒu guò lái...(H-O)

thisCL time just those threeCL child one side
eatZHE fruit one side walk across come
At this time just then those three boys walked over as they ate the fruit.

These examples provide adequate evidence that modification clauses with the possessive
marker DE tend to be longer and more complex in written narrative than in oral narratives.
In each of the above written narrative examples three to four ideas are presented in the
attributive clauses. In the oral narratives attributive clauses usually only one or sometimes
two ideas were presented.

3.9 Summary

In this chapter we have attempted to illustrate the uniqueness of spoken and written
narrative discourse in Mandarin Chinese. To do this we have provided numerous examples
from our discourse data that have clearly shown the various areas of differences between these two genres of discourse.

We began with a discussion of the historical perspective and the evolution of the Chinese language based on the work of Li and Thompson (1982). In this section we pointed out the influence that Classical and literary Chinese has had on modern written Chinese. We later saw evidence of this influence when we discussed the length of both the narratives and the individual idea units of the narratives. We also saw this influence in the grammatical marking (or lack thereof) in written narrative discourse as well as in the lexicon used in each of the narrative types.

I also showed that Chafe's (1982) notions of integration and involvement were apparent in both spoken and written narratives. I provided evidence that by means of integration the written narratives were more compact and syntactically more complex. The concept of involvement was apparent not only in some basic and fundamental differences between spoken and written narrative discourse but also in the areas of the length of narratives and I.U.'s, the amount of detail in the narratives, and the proportion of narrative versus evaluative I.U.'s in the narratives.

From this analysis we can safely state that written narrative discourse in Mandarin is more compact, and complex than oral narrative discourse. Written narrative discourse uses vocabulary from literary Chinese (wenyan wen) and coordination is carried out through syntactic structures rather than coordinating words. Modification clauses are longer and more complex than in oral narrative discourse. And, lastly, third-person pronoun marking and zero anaphora are equally important features in written narratives.

Oral narrative discourse proved to be longer and more "wordy" than written discourse. Idea units, on the other hand, were about the same length on average as in written discourse. These phrase-like units were loosely linked together with a number of
coordinating words. Oral discourse texts tended to include more detail than their written counterparts, and there was a greater tendency on the part of the narrators to comment on or evaluate the events in the oral versions. NP repetition and pronominalization were also common features of the oral narratives.

All in all we discovered a number of variations between spoken and written narrative discourse in Mandarin Chinese. We wish to point out here that our findings relate specifically to the variation that exists in spontaneous, informal, narrative discourse. Further research is needed to determine how broadly these features can be applied across discourse genres.

Notwithstanding the variation between spoken and written narrative discourse that has been discussed thus far, there remains another area of important variation that we have yet to explore. In the next chapter I will examine the aspect system in Chinese and analyze the variation that exists between these oral and written discourse in this regard. This will add a considerable amount of additional data that will strengthen and complement the information discussed in this chapter.
CHAPTER IV
ASPECTUAL VARIATION IN SPOKEN AND WRITTEN MANDARIN
NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

Aspect is a syntactic feature in Chinese that has caused much debate as to its true function. There have been debates as to whether there are two le's or just one, how and when the markers are used, and what the semantic domain of each of the markers is, particularly with respect to sentential le. The result of this long-standing debate on aspect in Chinese has not resulted in a consensus of understanding of this syntactic feature. Part of the problem may lie in the very nature of the various studies. Only a small percentage of the studies of aspect in Chinese analyze authentic discourse data, or in other words, how aspect really functions in the language as opposed to how it is supposed to according to some prescribed grammar.

In this chapter we attempt to shed some light on the aspect mystery by providing an accurate picture of which aspect strategies are most productive, where they appear, and the importance of aspect (specifically perfectivity) in narrative discourse. In 4.2 we will analyze the productivity and characteristics of the aspect marker le, both the perfective marker and the inchoative marker, as well as the dual function of this marker. In 4.3 we will look at resultative verb complements and their distribution and relation to the perfective aspect. This will be followed by a short discussion of verb reduplication in 4.4. Perfective guo and the Taiwan use of you will be addressed in sections 4.5 and 4.6 respectively. In 4.7 we will discuss the role of the zero aspect in the realm of the Chinese aspect system and
in 4.8 we will compare the different ways of marking aspect in terms of productivity and environment. In 4.9 we will summarize our findings

4.1 Productivity of the Aspect Marker le

By productivity we mean the number of times the aspectual le occurs in both the oral and written narratives. In our discussion in Chapter Two we learned that the perfective aspect plays a significant role in narrative discourse. The perfective aspect is a prominent syntactic feature in narrative clauses and functions to give the clauses a temporal sequence. In other words, it orders the clauses in such a way that one clause naturally precedes another and is followed by another according to the order in which the events occurred.

The inchoative aspect marker, as defined as part of the perfect aspect, plays a less significant role in narrative discourse. It does not order the sequences the way that the perfective aspect does. Rather it provides additional information that links a new state or situation to prior events or states. The occurrence of one aspect marker le with the functions of both perfectivity and inchoativity is also a possibility.

In light of this, we would expect to see a greater occurrence of the perfective aspect than of the inchoative aspect, and even less appearance of le with a dual function. For this experiment a count was made of all the perfective le markers, the inchoative le markers, and the markings of le that can be interpreted as conveying both perfectivity and inchoativeness. The Table below provides the numbers for the oral narratives.
Table 6: Productivity of aspectual *le* in oral narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMANT</th>
<th>PFV</th>
<th>INC</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these numbers, the perfective aspect occurs an average of 11.9 times per oral narrative. The inchoative aspect occurs an average of 2.4 times and *le* functioning as both perfective and inchoative occurs an average of .2 times per oral narrative. These numbers are not surprising considering our previous predictions. The perfective aspect marker occurs five times more than the inchoative aspect marker, and many times more than the dual function aspect marker. The inchoative aspect marker occurs twelve times more than the dual function aspect marker.

This clearly shows that the perfective aspect does play a significant role in oral narratives. It is also noteworthy to mention that the perfective *le* marker in Chinese occurred overwhelmingly in those I.U.'s that were narrative in nature and were almost completely absent in evaluative I.U.'s. This finding was consistent with Li, Thompson,
and Thompson's (1982) and Hopper's (1979a; 1979b) findings that the perfective aspect governs foregrounded clauses and the imperfective aspect governs backgrounded clauses.

Our findings of the frequency of use of the perfective aspect marker is contrary to previous studies. Christensen (1990) reported that it was the inchoative aspect marker that was more productive in Chinese. That study was not, however, based on authentic discourse samples, but focused on elicited native intuition. Through a series of written surveys it was determined that the inchoative aspect marker occurred more frequently than the perfective marker. In a follow up study Christensen (1991) compared these results with the results of an analysis of recorded conversations from both Taiwan and Beijing. The discourse data consisted of sixty minutes of recorded natural, spontaneous conversation from both Beijing and Taiwan, collected by Robert Sanders (personal communication). In the Beijing data Christensen found, that the perfective le occurred 115 times and the inchoative le occurred 135 times. In the Taiwan data, the perfective le occurred 25 times with the inchoative le occurring 48 times. In the Beijing data an almost equal ratio of the two markers was found but in the Taiwan data the inchoative marker occurred nearly twice as often as the perfective marker. In this study some of those aspect markers considered inchoative may also have carried a perfective meaning.

Another study (Hu 1990) also reported similar results. Hu did a comparative study between aspectual marking in Taiwan Mandarin and Beijing Mandarin. His data consisted of forty-five minutes of recorded spontaneous conversation of both Taiwan and Beijing (also collected by Dr. Robert Sanders). He reported that for the Beijing data the perfective marker occurred 42 times as opposed to 161 times for the inchoative or sentence final marker. In the Taiwan data, the perfective marker occurred 16 times and the inchoative 68 times. He states, "in both dialects, a single so called 'sentence-final le' in a sentence is the most used pattern" (Hu 1990: 12). The fact that a sentence final le in discourse may carry both meanings, perfective and inchoative, may also shed light on this apparent discrepancy.
A possible explanation for this observation may be that in natural conversation, when a sentence-final ́e appears, and a post-verbal ́e does not in an utterance, and the context dictates both a perfective and an inchoative meaning, it may be the case that the verbal ́e has been replaced by the zero aspect. In such a scenario, it is not the case that the sentence-final ́e also carries a perfective meaning; rather, the perfective meaning is interpreted by the verb with zero marking. This observation is merely speculative, and needs to be explored in more detail. However, it does seem to make sense.

Our findings in this study are in direct opposition to those previous findings. We believe the difference is due to the nature of the genres of discourse where the data was observed. In Hu (1990) and Christensen (1991) the data used was spontaneous, informal conversation, whereas our data here consists of oral and written narratives. As was mentioned above, the nature of narration dictates a high occurrence of the perfective aspect marker as it is the feature that orders the utterances in a sequential manner. Conversation is a very different kind of discourse where the inchoative aspect marker appears to have a broader function and is used more liberally than the perfective aspect marker. This may in part be attributed to the constant switching back and forth from one speaker to another. The use of inchoative (or sentential) ́e as a marker of mood may also be more apparent and productive in spontaneous, informal conversation where there is a higher rate of person-to-person interaction. Li and Thompson’s (1981) treatment of sentential ́e illustrates this particle as a mood marker. By mood marker we mean that the particle is used to denote the attitude of the speaker. For example, Li and Thompson refer to sentence-final ́e as having a communicative function (that is, it is most commonly used in communicative speech acts) with a variety of meanings including: correcting a wrong assumption, indicating progress so far, indicating what happens next, and closing a statement. In our narrative data, the function of sentence-final ́e as a mood marker was not apparent.
In the written narratives we find similar results though the aspect markers occurred less frequently. Table 7 shows the occurrence of these aspect markers in the written narratives.

Table 7: Productivity of aspectual le in written narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFORMANTS</th>
<th>PFV</th>
<th>INC</th>
<th>BOTH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The marking of aspectual le in the written narratives was consistent with the findings for the oral narratives. The perfective aspect occurred an average of 7.5 times per written narrative; the inchoative aspect occurred an average of 1.1 times; and the dual function of le did not occur in the written narratives. As with the oral narratives we see that the perfective aspect marker is much more productive than the inchoative marker or the dual aspect marker.

From these statistics we see that there is a significant difference in productivity of the aspectual marker le, for perfective, inchoative, and dual function, between the oral
and written narratives. The perfective aspect occurs 1.6 times more often in the oral narratives than in the written narratives (almost double). The inchoative aspect occurs just over twice (2.2 times) as much in the oral narratives than in the written narratives, and the dual function of le occurs twice as frequently in the oral narratives than in the written narratives.

These numbers were checked for statistical significance and it was found that for perfective le there was statistical significance in the oral narratives over the written narratives. For the other two categories, inchoative le, and the dual function, there was no statistical significance. This was due in part to the low frequency of these features in the narratives. We also would not expect significance in that it is the perfective aspect that is the dominant and more important aspect marker in narrative discourse.

For each of these features, a simple permutation test was done (Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test). This type of test was selected because of the relatively small numbers that we were working with. A point one-zero (.10) level was used, again because of the relatively small numbers being analyzed. Anything higher than .10 was considered not significant, and lower than that as significant. As mentioned above, this test revealed that there was statistic significance with perfective le (.0039) but not with inchoative le (.3281) or the dual function marker (.8125).

These numbers are consistent with our overall findings of the differences between oral and written narratives in Chinese in Chapter Three. There is a statistically higher frequency of the perfective aspect marker le in the oral narratives, than in the written narratives. This is due to several reasons, among those being the short-term memory limitations of both speaker and hearer in spoken discourse. A speaker is likely to use aspect markers more frequently in order for the meaning of each utterance to be clearly understood by the listener. The writer, on the other hand, with more time, can develop a more complex structure that may rely more on the structure of the sentence and its relationship to the text.
as a whole for aspectual meaning and other syntactic phenomena. As was discussed in Chapter Three, the history of Chinese writing, as it evolved from Classical Chinese to literary Chinese and on to modern Chinese, must also be considered. The practice in Classical and literary Chinese to omit numerous grammatical features has trickled down into the syntax and practices of modern writing.

With regards to aspect, we have shown that in oral narrative discourse there is a greater tendency to be more explicit with aspectual marking. In other words, aspectual marking with  lavoro is much more productive in oral narrative discourse than in written narrative discourse.

4.1.1 Perfective *le*

In this section we will provide a number of examples from the data that shows the typical usage of the perfective aspect marker *le* as well as the contexts in which it is used. We will first cite examples from the oral narratives. The underlined portion indicates the verb with perfective marking.

(1) ránhòu tā dǎle ge kǒushào, jiù gāosu tā...(A-O)
    after  he hitLE CL whistle   then inform him
Then he whistled to get his attention.

(2) hòulái zhèi xiǎo hái jiù nále yī kuāng lí jiù wàng zìxíngchē de qiántou fàng...(E-O)
    after  this small child then takeLE one basket pear then toward bicycle DE front place
Then the little kid took a basket of pears and placed them on the front of his bike.
(3)  dàn hòulái tā  gǎibiànle  zhǔyì...  (F-0)
    however after he changeLE idea
    However, then he changed his mind.

(4)  Tā de màozi yè  diàole... (B-0)
    his CL hat also fallLE
    His hat also fell.

In each of these examples we see typical uses of aspectual le to indicate perfectivity. Perfectivity in these examples indicates completion as opposed to termination which is also a possible interpretation depending on the context. There are basically two environments that we observe perfective le in. One is in the first clause of an utterance containing two or more clauses as in (1) and (2). In these contexts the perfective marker signals the completion of the first clause before the inception of the second clause. In the other cases, (examples 3 & 4), perfective le merely indicates the completion of the action in the clause.

It is also possible is some contexts for the perfective marker in the first clause indicate that the action will be complete before the inception of the action in the second clause, even if the whole utterance is in the future. (4) below illustrates this usage.

(5)  Wǒmen chīle fàn, jiù kàn diànyǐng.
    we  eatLE meal then watch movie
    After we eat, we'll watch a movie.

In this kind of context, both actions indicated are in the future, at least have not occurred at speech time. In these types of cases perfective le does not imply completed action in the
normal sense, but rather that the action in the first clause will be completed before the action in the second clause occurs. (5) is a simple example of how with the perfective aspect one looks at a situation as a whole, from the outside, and as is true for aspect as a system, there is no reference to speech time.

4.1.2 Inchoative le

As indicated above, the inchoative aspect marker \textit{le} is not as productive in narrative discourse as perfective \textit{le}. It nevertheless plays the important role of indicating the inception of a new idea, event, or situation. The examples below illustrate typical uses of the inchoative aspect in our data.

(6) Tā yīge lánzi de lǐzi quán bù jiàn \textit{le}... (B-O)
he oneCL basket DE pear complete not see LE
One of his baskets of fruit was completely gone.

(7) Yīnwei tā tuǐ yǐjǐng shuāihuài, bù néng qí \textit{le}...(E-O)
because his leg already fall down-badLE not able ride LE
Because his leg was already injured from the fall, he wasn't able to ride (now).

(8) Zìjǐ bù xiǎoxīn jiù zhuàngdào yīkuài shítou shàng \textit{le}...(E-O)
self not careful then hit into oneCL rock top LE
(He) himself was not careful and ran into a rock.
Each of these examples shows a typical use of the inchoative aspect marker in oral narrative discourse. In (6), in the prior situation there are three baskets but the inception of the new situations reveals that one is missing. In (7) we see that the boy can no longer ride his bike, whereas previously he could. This represents a changed state, or the inception of a new state. Finally, in (8) we see that the new state indicates that he is no longer riding along on his bike, but has run into a rock, and consequently has come to a stop.

These kinds of I.U.'s, that is those with the inchoative aspect marker, are not essential to the temporal structure of a narrative discourse. As a result, they occur much less frequently than the perfective marker. Some scholars (Li and Thompson 1981; Chao 1968) refer to the inchoative or sentence final marker ıle as a mood marker. This however, does not seem to be the case in narrative discourse. In other genres of discourse, such as conversation, this viewpoint may be more applicable. For our purposes here the inchoative aspect marker played a consistent role of indicating the inception of a new state or situation.

4.1.3 The Dual Function of the Aspect Marker ıle

As others (Chan 1980; Kwan-Terry 1979; Chao 1968; Christensen 1990) have pointed out, there are times when one aspect marker (ıle) appears in sentence-final position and post-verbally simultaneously. In such cases, without the proper context it is difficult to determine which ıle it is, perfective, inchoative, or a combination of the two. It is not uncommon for one ıle to appear and indicate both perfectivity and inchoativity at the same time. However, just because one ıle may appear in this position does not mean that it obligatorily has a dual function, only if context dictates that kind of meaning. For example, the I.U. below shows ıle appearing post-verbally and at the end of the clause but still only retaining the perfective function. Of course this phrase can only be understood by examining its surrounding context.
(9) Tāmen jiù zǒu le...(A-O)
    they then walk LE
    They then left.

In the next example we see the dual function of this aspect marker.

(10) ...tā yǐwéi shuō bèi nèi sānge wánpi de xiǎo hái
gěi gěi chī le...(D-O)
    he think speak by those threeCL naughty DE small child
    by by eat LE
    He figured that (they) had been eaten by those three naughty boys.

This clause indicates perfectivity in that the pears have been eaten and inchoativity in that the pears have disappeared or changed from a state when they were in the basket to a state of them being gone.

In reference to our count of this type of aspectual marking we see that this phenomenon, that is aspectual le functioning as both perfective and inchoative is rather uncommon in our narrative discourse texts. In the oral narratives this type of marking only occurred a total of two times as opposed to 119 times for the perfective and 24 times for the inchoative aspect. In the written narratives aspect was marked 75 times for the perfective and 11 times for the inchoative. This indicates that aspectual marking in narrative discourse is most likely to be indicated with the specific marker be it perfective le or inchoative le. This again is most likely due to the structure of narrative discourse that favors the perfective aspect marker alone to any other type of aspect marking. This also confirms Li and
Thompson's (1979) observation that the sentence-final \textit{le} seldom occurs in written discourse, especially more formal genres of written discourse.

4.2 Perfectivity with Resultative Verb Complements

According to our data, of all the ways of indicating perfectivity in Mandarin Chinese narrative discourse, using resultative verb complements (RVC) is by far the most productive. A small percentage of the time, perfective \textit{le} is used in conjunction with an RVC. The Table below shows the productivity of RVC's in our narrative discourse data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>ORAL</th>
<th>WRITTEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>w/\textit{le}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the oral narratives RVC's were used to convey perfectivity a total of 182 times or an average of 18.2 times per narrative. Of those 182 times 38 appeared with the perfective \textit{le}. 
In the written narratives, RVC's were used to convey perfectivity a total of 63 times or an average of 6.3 times per narrative. Of those 63 times 5 occurred with perfective 了. These findings are consistent with our previous findings and concur with Li and Thompson's observations of syntactic marking in written narratives. RVC's occurred almost three times (2.88) more in the oral narratives than in the written narratives. Dual marking, that is both the RVC and perfective 了 occurred 7.6 times more in the oral narratives than in the written narratives. This further supports our point that syntactic marking is much more prevalent in oral narrative discourse than in written narrative discourse.

The distribution of result RVC's and directional RVC's was very similar for both the oral and written narratives. In the oral narratives 63% of the RVC's were resultative and 36% directional. In the written narratives the ratio was 64% resultative and 37% directional.

The productivity results were also checked for statistical significance with the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test and it was found that there was statistical significance in the RVC's in the oral narratives over the written narratives (.0020). This provides additional evidence of the importance of perfective aspect marking in oral narratives.

Below we will illustrate typical usage of RVC's to convey perfection.

(11) 他 用 梯 子 爬 树 上 去 摘 梨子...(A-O)

he use ladder climb-arrive tree up go pick pear

He used a ladder to climb up into the tree to pick pears.
(12) Zhèishí tā kànjiàn sānge nán hái dà yáo dà bǎi de guòlái ...(J-O)
    this time he look-achieve threeCL male child big shake big shake
    across come
    At that time he saw three boys saunter past.

(13) hái bāng tā jiǎnqǐ yī kuāng de lízi.(C-W)
    still help him collect-up one basket DE pear
    (They) also helped him pick up the basketful of pears.

(14) pánɡguān de yǒu lìng sānge xiǎo hái bāng tā shòuhǎo lízi.(D-W)
    look on DE have other threeCL small child help him
    collect-complete pear
    Three other kids that were looking on helped him collect the pears.

In these examples, taken both from the oral and written narratives, we see that the use of RVC's is both a common way to indicate perfectivity in Chinese but also is oftentimes a more effective and contextually appropriate way to do it. In other words RVC's often give a more precise and direct meaning than using perfective le, or another form of perfective. For example, the word jiǎnqǐ in (12) indicates that the pears were picked up as opposed to just collected, thus providing a directional and achievement component. Likewise in (11) the RVC dào in párào also indicates a directional component to the verb, so instead of merely indicating that the man climbed, he climbed to a destination, into the tree.
4.3 Verb Reduplication

The reduplication of a verb, with the pattern $V + (y i) + V$, is also another way to convey perfectivity in Chinese. When a verb is used in this manner it represents doing an action "a little bit" or for a short period of time, or to do something casually. Li and Thompson refer to this as the "delimitative aspect" (1981: 232), Smith (1991) refers to this as "tentative reduplication" (356), and Chao (1968) as "tentative aspect." Chao states that it indicates the tentative notion 'just' or 'make a try.' We are not claiming here that in all cases and contexts that verb reduplication conveys the meaning of perfectivity. We wish to point out that in some contexts it truly conveys a tentative notion, but in certain contexts it can also indicate perfectivity.

In our data, this form of indicating perfectivity was not very productive. In fact it is the least productive of the ways to indicate perfectivity. Table 8 below indicates the occurrences of verb reduplication that conveyed perfectivity.
Table 9: Productivity of verb reduplication in narrative discourse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the oral narratives verb reduplication only occurred five times and in the written narratives only once. Though the overall occurrences of verb reduplication were low it still occurred five times more often in the oral narratives than in the written. These numbers were also run through a Wilcoxon Singed Rank Test and were found to be statistically significant (.0625). This again supports our earlier findings of the importance of perfective aspect marking in oral narratives.

Below are examples of verb reduplication in our narrative data.

(15) _ránhòu tā bǎ wéijīn ná xiàlái cāvicā...(G-O)_
    after he take scarf grasp down-come wipe-one-wipe

Then he got out a scarf and wiped it (the pear).
(16) ránhòu kànkan tāde bāba...(H-0)
after look-look hisDE daddy
then he looked at his daddy...

(17) Kànkan zhāi lízi de rén zài shù shàng zhuānxīn zhāi lízi méi zhùyì...(G-W)
look-look pick pear DE person in tree top absorbed pick pear not have pay attention
(He) saw that the man was in the tree absorbed in his picking and not paying attention...

(18) Tāmen yě méiyǒu qù bāng tā, jiù zhèiyàng kànnyīkàn...(C-O)
they also not-have go help him then this-way look-one-look
They also hadn't gone to help him, (they) just looked at him.

(19) ránhòu kànnyīkàn nèige shù shàng zhāi de rén hěn zhuānxīn...(G-O))
after look-one-look thatCL tree top pick DE person very concentrate
then (he) looked at that person in the tree absorbed in picking...

In each of these examples the reduplicated verb conveys a perfective meaning in the clause, even though they may also indicate the action was performed in a casual manner. The verb
cā, to wipe, was used once and the only other verb used in this way was kàn, to see. The perfective meaning of that these verbs convey also gives the utterances a sense of temporal order as with the other markers of perfectivity.

4.4 Perfective guo

As was discussed in Chapter Two, Smith (1991) also includes post-verbal guo in her treatment of the viewpoint aspect. Generally it conveys the meaning that a particular situation or event has happened at least once in the past. It can also indicate simple completion in some contexts, and often occurs simultaneously with perfective le. It is also relatively common for perfective guo to occur with perfective le in the same clause, just as perfective le occurred with RVC’s. We already pointed out the differences it has with the perfective le so we won’t mention that again here.

In these narrative discourse texts there were no occurrences of guo used to convey perfectivity. This indicates to us that this type of perfectivizing is not as productive as the other forms discussed in this chapter. The nature of the narratives that were produced in our experiment also were not very conducive for the use of the perfective guo. Despite the fact that this perfective marker did not occur in our data we feel it is nonetheless an integral part of the aspect system in Chinese and thus we will cite some examples of its use in a natural discourse text. The examples cited below come from a series of recorded spontaneous, informal conversations collected under the direction of Dr. Robert Sanders. The examples below are from articulate Chinese college students in Taiwan.
(20) Mǎi huí lái zhīqián, yǐjīng zài diàn lǐ chīguo le...(Sanders: Shifan)
    buy return come before, already at restaurant inside eatGUO LE
    Before coming back, (he) had already eaten (it) at the shop.[referring to ice cream]

(21) Chīguo fàn...(Sanders: Shifan)
    eatGUO meal
    (I've) eaten.[in response to the question if he'd eaten]

(22) Zhèi yǐqián wǒmen yǒu zuòguo...(Sanders: Bob F)
    this before we have doGUO
    We have done this before.[referring to making posters]

As (22) indicates, guo often occurs to indicate an event or situation in the remote past as opposed to an event or situation that just occurred. In (20) and (21) however, we have simple statements with perfective guo indicating completion similar to perfective le.

These examples illustrate the perfectivizing function of this morpheme and supports Smith's treatment of it. We can only assume that because it did not appear in our narrative discourse data, that it is not very productive in the context of narrative discourse.

4.5 Perfectivity with you

The aspectual function of the morpheme yǒu in Mandarin Chinese has been a particularly tricky problem to identify and describe. As mentioned in Chapter Two, Wang (1965) has postulated that it was an older form of perfective le that gradually faded from
use. According to his analysis the two morphemes had an equal semantic function. Christensen (1990) suggested forming a new aspectual category, the existential aspect, to account for the use of yōu in Taiwan Mandarin that seems to function similarly to perfective le. When used in a pre-verbal position it seems to indicate perfectivity. This also was postulated by Christensen (1990), but his supporting data at that time was based on native speakers’ intuition and not on discourse data.

It was with some disappointment that we discovered that there were no occurrences of yōu in our narrative discourse texts. An extensive, but random survey of literary and academic papers, pieces of fiction, both literary and colloquial, and movie scripts (all of Taiwan origin), also failed to identify yōu in a context that conveyed perfectivity. After analyzing several of the aforementioned Sanders transcripts this elusive morpheme was discovered in an authentic context. It appears that the morpheme yōu, used to convey perfectivity, only occurs in the most casual, spontaneous, and informal of contexts. We also cannot dismiss the numerous sociolinguistic factors that also may influence the use of this marker, such as gender, age, and so on. In this case it was casual conversation among close friends. Though the citations were considered very awkward, and even ungrammatical, to my informants from the Mainland, they nevertheless were uttered by highly educated individuals from Taiwan. Those speakers of Mandarin from Taiwan did not find them awkward, but rather quite natural. Why then does this word, when indicating perfectivity, not appear in any other type of discourse, written or spoken? It is almost as if the phenomenon does not exist in the language except in very casual conversation. The answer to this question no doubt is in part due to the influence of the so-called "Standard Mandarin" that has been so vigorously promoted on the island of Taiwan. The fact that it does not occur in written discourse is no surprise, being that the written language is much more formalized and careful and more likely to stick with the "standard." Why it does not
occur in speech, other than that indicated, can only be speculated on. It is most likely due to the fact that outside of unplanned, informal speech, people are more aware of, and consciously try to speak as close to the standard as possible. The examples cited below clearly show the use of you to convey perfectivity.

(23) Wǒmen you zài nàr mǎi...(Sanders: Bob F)
    we YOU at there buy
    We bought it there.

(24) Wǒ lǐmiàn you chuān zhèige...(Sanders: Bob F)
    I inside YOU put on thisCL
    I put this on inside.

(25) Nǐ you shōudào wǒ de xīn hò...(Sanders: Shifan)
    you YOU receive my DE letter PRT
    You received my letter.

(26) Tā běnlái you jiào tā chūlái lá...(Sanders: Shifan)
    he originally YOU call him out-come PRT
    He originally told him to come out.

(27) nǐmen shéi you kàn...
    you who YOU read
    Who of you has read (it) [referring to a book]
Wǒ yǒu kàn...(Sanders: shifan)

I YOU read

I read (it).

These examples effectively illustrate the use of yǒu in a perfective context. Even though this phenomenon occurs in a rather limited context, (spontaneous, informal spoken discourse in Taiwan Mandarin), it nevertheless cannot be ignored. and should be included in a description of the aspect system in Mandarin Chinese. It may not be worthy of an extensive treatment but it at least should be discussed. It is also worth mentioning that there are other dialects of Chinese where this does occur, such as Cantonese and Southern Min. It is therefore, not an isolated, arbitrary feature; rather it is a function most probably borrowed from Southern Min, which is commonly spoken in Taiwan.

4.6 The Perfective Aspect and Temporal Sequence

As was mentioned above, the perfective aspect plays a significant role in the ordering or temporal sequence of a narration. In very rudimentary terms, perfectivity indicates a whole situation that has an end (Comrie 1976). Narrative consists of the sequential telling of events or situations. For example, the narrator will mention one event that occurred, followed by another, and another. The events follow a logical order; that is, the first event precedes the second, and the second before the third, and so on in the order in which they are perceived in the conceptual world, that is, the way the world is perceived by both speaker and listener. The perfective aspect plays the role of indicating that an event has come to completion, enabling the next event to be reported. Even if the perfective aspect is not explicitly marked, the sequencing of the events in the narrative provides the context to convey a perfective interpretation of the events reported.
Word order in Chinese is also related to the ordering of events in a narrative. Tai (1985; 1989) has convincingly pointed out that temporal sequence plays an important role in Chinese word order. He bases his argument on what he calls the Principle of Temporal Sequence or PTS. He defines this principle as: "the relative word order between two syntactic units is determined by the temporal order of the states which they represent in the conceptual world" (Tai 1985: 50). Just as word order in Chinese follows a conceptual order of the world, it also appears that spontaneous narratives also follow a like order. That is, events are reported in the order in which they occurred in the real world. In literature (creative writing) there are many devices used to tell a story that do not follow a strict chronological order. Features such as flashbacks, regression, and so forth are such devices. These types of devices were not used in Chinese literature until rather late, and were probably borrowed from the West. Though these strategies of narrating events exist, they are rare when relating personal experiences or narrating events that were seen or experienced. In the narratives collected for this study, a strict chronological order was followed based on the way the sequences were arranged in the pear film.

In many of the utterances quoted thus far, there is often a two clause structure. In the first clause the perfective 他 clearly indicates that this clause must precede the second clause. The word 旧, then, in many cases begins the second clause.

In the example below, taken from one of the oral narratives, we observe the frequent use of the perfective aspect, whether it be the perfective 他 or an RVC. Each of the perfectivizing features is underlined for clarity. Again, the three dots (...) following a clause indicates the end of an idea unit.

(28) 男 háizi qíle yīliàng ellido śćǐxǐngché...  
    male child rideLE oneCL bicycle
    ... the boy rode a bicycle...
cóng líshù xiàmiàn lùguò...
from pear tree below pass by
... and passed by under the pear tree...

uh, tā kànjiānle dìshàng de liǎngkuāng lí...
uh he saw-achieveLE ground DE two-basket pear
uh, he saw two baskets of pears on the ground...

jiù bā chēzi tíngxiàlái...
then take bike stop-down-come
then he stopped the bike...

bā chēzi qīngqīng de fàngdào dìshàng...(F-O)
take bike lightly-lightly DE place-to ground
(he) took the bike and lightly placed it on the ground...

In this typical sample of an oral narrative we clearly see the frequent use of the perfective aspect. In this particular example we see the perfective le used once and RVC's used four times. Below is another example of the prevalence of perfective aspeccual marking and its relation to temporal sequence, in the oral narrative texts.

(29) Tā jiǎnqǐlái...
he pick-up
He picked (it up)...)
ránhòu tā bǎ wéijīn náxiàlái cāyicā...
after he take scarf grasp-down-come wipe-one-wipe
then he took out a scarf and wiped (it)...
cā gānjìng yǐhòu yòu fàng huíqù...
wipe clean after again place back-go
After (he) wiped it clean (he) put it back...
fànghǎole yǐhòu tā jiù yòu shàng shùshàng qù zhāi lízi...
place-attain-LE after he then again ascend tree-top go pick pear
After returning (the fruit), he then again climbed into the tree to pick pears...
uh, zhèige shǐhòu wǒmen jiù tīngdào yáng de jiào shēng...
uh thisCL time we then hear-attain goat DE call sound
uh, at this time we then hear the sound of a goat bleating...
ránhòu jiù yǒu yīge fàng yáng de rén qiānzhe yǐzhī yáng zǒuquòlái...(G-O).
after then have oneCL place goat DE person lead-ZHE oneCL goat walk-over-come
then (there was) a shepherd that came over leading a goat.

In this series of I.U.'s we also see at least one perfectivizing feature in each of the I.U.'s. Here, we see not only perfective le and RVC's but also a case of verb reduplication. In both of these examples (5 & 6), we see that it is the perfective feature that indicates the
completion of one event before the inception of a new event. For example, in (29) it is quite clear that we first hear the bleating of the goat before the shepherd and the goat walk by. In these examples we have shown how the perfective aspect orders the temporal sequence in a narrative text. The perfective aspect marking in conjunction with the natural word order of Chinese clearly indicates the temporal sequence that exists in these narrative texts. Since narrative texts are so closely linked to the sequencing of events it is only natural that the perfective aspect also plays an important role in narrative discourse.

In light of this discussion, we agree with Hopper that aspect has a discourse function (as we have shown in Chinese). The primary purpose of the perfective aspect is to give a temporal order to sets of sequential events or actions.

4.7 The Zero Aspect in Narrative Discourse

The zero aspect is by far the most difficult of aspectual categories to both define and to identify in a text. Because aspectual marking is optional, the potentiality of zero aspect is staggering. It is easy to assume that because the marking of perfective and inchoative aspect markers is less frequent in written narratives that the zero aspect would then be more prevalent. Though this is a logical claim, identifying cases of zero aspect is still problematic. In a narration, point of view, or the way a story is told, plays a role in how aspect is marked. For example, in English one can narrate past events by using the present tense in many cases. In our data the narrators sometimes told the story with the durative aspect instead of the perfective aspect, especially in the oral narratives. Sometimes the informant narrated the events as completed actions and at other times related the events in a progressive sense. For example, some of the informants used a perfective when describing the boy on the bike saying: qíle zìxíngchē and others used the imperfective saying: qízhi zìxíngchē.
It is also easy to assume that any narration of past events must have inherent perfective aspectual meaning whether it is marked or not. When we translate these types of utterances in English we naturally use the past tense, even though the actual Chinese may not explicitly indicate a past or completed event. Often in these types of cases the overall context (i.e. the narration of past events/experiences) carries the connotation of completed actions whether it is marked that way or not. We also found in these narratives that the imperfective aspect was used primarily in evaluative I.U.'s.

The problem lies in identifying the specific places (e.g. verb) where an aspectual meaning is implied by the context. The table below shows the number of I.U.'s that did not have any perfective or inchoative aspect marking, that is those I.U.'s that did not have perfective or inchoative i.e. an RVC, or verb repetition. The first number represents the number of I.U.'s that did not have this aspectual marking, and the second number indicates the total number of I.U.'s in that narrative. For example, for informant A, 23 out of 52 I.U.'s in his oral narrative did not have any explicit perfective or inchoative aspect marking.
Table 10: I.U.'s with no perfective or inchoative aspectual marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23/(52)</td>
<td>11/(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>20/(40)</td>
<td>6/(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25/(44)</td>
<td>4/(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11/(26)</td>
<td>3/(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>35/(66)</td>
<td>2/(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22/(72)</td>
<td>3/(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>28/(80)</td>
<td>5/(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>60/(95)</td>
<td>13/(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>26/(55)</td>
<td>9/(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>17/(47)</td>
<td>3/(43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these numbers 46% of the I.U.'s in the oral narratives were not marked explicitly for perfectivity or inchoativity. In the written narratives 33% of the I.U.'s were not marked. These unmarked I.U.'s then, were either utterances narrated in a progressive sense, thus not requiring any aspectual marking, they were marked with the imperfective aspect, or they had the zero aspect.

Notwithstanding the difficulty of identifying the zero aspect in a discourse text, an attempt was made at counting the number of I.U.'s where the zero aspect was easily observed. These were I.U.'s where, theoretically, an aspect marker such as \( \text{le} \) or an RVC could have been inserted without changing the meaning of the clause. Let us make it clear that these numbers are arbitrary at best and are only listed to show the potential of the case of using the zero aspect. It is an uncertain and subjective game trying to decide where a perfective aspect marker can or cannot appear. Table 9 below shows the number of
occurrences when it was felt the perfective aspect marker 'e could have been inserted naturally without upsetting the meaning of the clause.

Table 11: Productivity of the zero aspect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Oral</th>
<th>Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With a total of 20 occurrences in the oral narratives, the zero aspect occurs an average of 2 times per narrative. In the written narratives, the zero aspect occurred 11 times to make it 1.1 times average occurrence per narrative.

Below are several examples of those kinds of zero aspect that are not difficult to interpret and where the context provides the necessary information to understand clearly the meaning of the utterance. The verb where the zero aspect is implied is underlined
(30) ránhòu tā jiù kàn tā yī yān...(H-O)
    afterward he then  look him one eye
    Then, he glanced at him...

To further support the notion that the use of the zero aspect is arbitrary and up to the person speaking, another informant produced this exact utterance but used the perfective le.

(31) ránhòu nàge nán xiǎo hái tíngle zìxíngchē, huítóu
    kànle tā yī yān...(G-O)
    afterward thatCL male small child stopLE bicycle, turn around
    lookLE him one eye
    Then, that small boy turned around and glanced at him.

In both of these utterances we have the same meaning even though one does not mark the perfective aspect. In these kinds of cases it is not difficult to identify the zero aspect. Incidentally both of these informants were female from Taiwan thus lessening the chances of dialectal or gender variation. A few more examples are provided below.

(32) suǒyǐ tā jiù pāi tā de jiǎo...(H-O)
    therefore he then  pat his DE foot
    Therefore he patted his foot.
(33) hòulái kàn tā shízi shì méiyǒu yī diǎn yào wàng xià kàn de yīsī, jiù juédìng ná yī kuāng...(I-O)
    after look him certain is not have one point need toward
down look DE meaning, then decide take one basket
Then, he saw that he certainly had no intention of looking down, so he
took a basket.

In the written narratives we see basically the same types of contexts where the zero aspect
is used. The examples below are from the written narrative texts.

(34) jiù cóng kuāngzi lǐ nále sānge lí gěi tāmen.(E-W)
    then from basket inside graspLE threeCL pear give them
Then he took three pears out of the basket and gave (them) to them.

(35) fú tā qǐlái, bāng tā jiǎn lízi...(B-W)
    support him up-come help him pick up pear
(They) helped him up and helped him pick up the pears

Even if aspectual marking in a Chinese narrative is absent, it nevertheless still plays an
important and integral part in the ordering and interpretation of this genre of discourse. It
also should be pointed out here that the zero aspect in these narrative texts always referred
to the perfective aspect. In those places of the narratives where we might anticipate the
deletion of the inchoative aspect marker (usually after a stative verb), explicit marking was
always present. This indicates that the zero aspect is more closely related to perfective and
imperfective aspect marking than with inchoative aspect marking.
As we have seen in this section, the zero aspect is not only productive in narrative discourse, but also is an important part of the aspect system as a whole. If one is to truly understand the aspect system in Chinese, one must also understand when and why aspect marking does not occur. Unfortunately, the answer to this problem is beyond the scope of this study. The zero aspect appears to be arbitrary and up to the discretion of the speaker/writer. When a verb does not have any aspectual marking it more than likely appears in a grounding type of sentence, or in a phrase that is narrated in the progressive aspect.

The numbers for the productivity of zero aspect failed to show any statistical significance when checked with the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. It is worth pointing out again that counting zero aspect spaces in a discourse text is tricky work. Even with the surrounding context it is sometimes difficult to tell if the narrator intended for a particular phrase to be narrated in the progressive or as completed actions. Without this certainty it is indeed difficult to make an accurate count.

4.8 Comparing the Different Means of Marking Perfectivity

When most people think about aspect, especially the perfective aspect, in Chinese, they think of the aspect marker 了. Though this is a marker commonly used in Chinese discourse to convey perfectivity, it is certainly not the only way. Above we have also discussed other ways to mark perfectivity, such as: resultative verb complements, verb reduplication, perfective 了, and the Taiwan use of 你. From our data in oral and written narrative discourse we specifically discussed three main ways of conveying perfectivity: with perfective 了, RVC's, and verb reduplication. We also discussed the inchoative aspect marker 了, and the role of the zero aspect. In this section we will compare our findings to better clarify which are the most productive ways to mark aspect as well as the general distribution of aspectual marking in Chinese narratives.
In the Tables below, we provide the distribution of the different ways to mark perfectivity, that is via perfective le, RVC's, and verb repetition. We also include the length, in number of I.U.'s, for each narrative. Table 10 is for the oral narratives and Table 8 for the written narratives.

Table 12: Productivity of perfective aspect marking in oral narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>le</th>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>V-Redup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totais</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Productivity of perfective aspect marking in written narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>lē</th>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>V-Redup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keep in mind that occurrences of the inchoative aspect and the occurrences of lē when it carries a dual function are not shown in these tables. Also note that there are times when the number of aspectual markings is greater than the number of I.U.'s in a narrative. In many cases there were multiple aspectual markings in a single I.U. For example, it was relatively common to have a perfective lē, as well as up to several RVC's in one I.U., especially in the written narratives. For this reason it is nearly impossible to get an accurate count of the percentage of I.U.'s that have a particular aspectual marking. Instead we will provide the average percentage of I.U.'s that had a particular aspect marking. We will provide these numbers in Table 12 below.
Table 14: Average percentages of perfective aspect marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>le</th>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>Verb Redup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Narrative I.U.'s</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Narrative I.U.'s</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to these numbers, in the oral narratives 21% of the I.U.'s were marked with perfective le, 40% were marked with RVC's, and 1% were marked with verb reduplication. The numbers for the written narratives are somewhat misleading. We have stated throughout this study (Chapters 3 & 4) that there is more explicit syntactic marking in the oral narratives than in the written narratives. The reason these numbers seem so inflated is partly due to the fact that many of the I.U.'s in the written narratives were relatively long and consequently often contained multiple aspect marking, as was mentioned above. Of course not all I.U.'s had an RVC or perfective le marking as we mentioned earlier that 31% of the I.U.'s in the written narratives did not have any aspectual marking. These numbers are overly inflated for the simple fact that some I.U.'s had multiple aspect markers. Another factor that should be considered is the relatively high number of I.U.'s in the oral narratives that were evaluative in nature. Generally speaking these clauses did not have perfective aspect. By subtracting these I.U.'s from the total count we come up with a slightly higher percentage in the oral narratives. Incidentally, those I.U.'s that did not contain perfective aspect marking contained either no aspect marking (i.e. it wasn't required), the zero aspect (i.e. aspect marking was optionally not marked, but retained a perfective meaning), the inchoative aspect, or the imperfective aspect. We must also take into account the unique characteristics of oral discourse, such as the many kinds of disfluencies that have been discussed. These oral devices also disproportionately raise the number of I.U.'s that are counted when analyzing the productivity of aspect marking. Because most of the I.U.'s in the written narratives were
solid, substantial, and oftentimes lengthy sentences, they contained many of the usual devices found in discourse.

According to our statistics, the most productive type of perfective aspect marking in both the oral and written narratives was with RVC's, followed by perfective i.e., and distantly with verb reduplication.

4.9 Summary

Throughout this Chapter we have explored many areas of the aspect system in Chinese. In section 4.9.1 we will summarize our findings of the general features of aspectual marking in Chinese narrative discourse. In section 4.9.2 we will summarize our findings of the aspectual differences between oral and written narrative discourse.

4.9.1 Aspectual Marking in Narrative Discourse

In this study it has been suggested that aspect in Chinese is a discourse function motivated by the need for temporal ordering in narrative discourse texts. In this sense it is more relevant to the perfective aspect than the imperfective aspect in narratives. The perfective aspect plays a particularly important role in this framework. In that the perfective aspect deals specifically with the verbal system in Chinese, the action of events or situations are at the core of a narrative process. Taking this into consideration, it is no surprise that perfective aspect markers are so prevalent in this narrative data, and that inchoative marking is so sparse. Other genres of discourse undoubtedly have a higher productivity of the inchoative aspect marker over the perfective marker, as was mentioned above. In narrative discourse however, the opposite was found.

Of the perfective aspect markers used, RVC's were the most productive. This may in part be due to the specific information that can be conveyed when using RVC's as opposed to other forms that give information that is less specific.
4.9.2 Aspectual Variation in Oral and Written Narrative Discourse

The most significant difference between the aspectual marking in oral and written narrative discourse was the productivity of the various markers. The Tables below indicate the average number of aspect markers that occurred in each narrative.

Table 15: Average occurrence of aspect marking in oral narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Marking</th>
<th>Average per narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfective le</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inchoative le</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual function of le</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb reduplication</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Average occurrence of aspect marking in written narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Marking</th>
<th>Average per narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfective le</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inchoative le</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual function le</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb reduplication</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total the oral narratives averaged 37.9 viewpoint aspect markings per narrative. The written narratives averaged 19.2 markings per narrative. Aspect marking in the oral narratives were almost twice (1.97) as productive as in the written narratives. Table 15,
below, shows the breakdown of the number of times more the aspect markers occurred in the oral narratives.

Table 17: Ratio of aspect marking in oral over written narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect Marking</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perfective le</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inchoative le</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dual function of le</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RVC</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verb reduplication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total marking average</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In light of these numbers we see that in all areas, aspect marking in the oral narratives was at least 1.5 times more productive than in the written narratives. These results confirm our previous claims that syntactic marking, in general, is more productive in oral discourse than in written discourse. The reasons for this phenomenon has already been addressed.

The statistics that we have presented here in this section should clear up any question about the productivity of these markers that were presented in earlier sections. It is clear from these Tables (13,14,15) that aspectual marking has a higher rate of frequency in oral narratives than in written narratives. We also restate here that the occurrence of perfective aspect markers (perfective le, RVC's, and verb reduplication) were found to be statistically significant whereas the inchoative marker, whereas that of the dual function le was not statistically significant. The fact that oral narratives are inherently longer only strengthens our claim. In oral narrative discourse it takes longer, and thus the use of more syntactic devices, to express the same thing (a series of events or other information) that is produced in a written narrative text.
CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

We began this study by stating that our purpose was to examine the differences between spoken and written discourse in Mandarin Chinese, and to expressly analyze perfectivity and inchoativity in the Chinese aspect system and how they functions in each of these two genres of discourse. We have adhered to this purpose throughout this study and have attempted to provide adequate data to point out effectively the many significant differences between oral and written discourse, specifically narrative discourse.

We have learned in this study that the analysis of discourse is a multi-faceted discipline and that different genres of discourse may have vast differences in both organization and internal features, such as syntax and lexicon. Though the greatest differences probably lie in the gulf between informal spoken and formal written discourse, we have also shown that there is significant differences between like genres of oral and written discourse; in our case oral narrative discourse and written narrative discourse.

The genres of discourse, and more especially genres within the oral/written domain, have unique characteristics, so much so that we cannot assume that narrative discourse, (or any other genre of discourse) is the same for both written and oral modes. The fact that significant differences were found between spoken and written narratives in this study further strengthens the claim that oral and written discourse is very different. For this reason we wish to emphasize that our findings here relate exclusively to spoken and written narrative discourse, and there has been no attempt to apply our claims to any other genre of discourse except in very general terms.
In short we have gained valuable information in the following areas: One, we have documented the various differences between oral and written narrative discourse. Two, we have given a broad description of perfectivity and inchoativity in the aspect system of Chinese, not relying only on specific aspect markers, but also on other ways of conveying aspectual meaning. And three, we have discussed the role of aspect, particularly the role of the perfective aspect in Chinese narrative discourse.

In this chapter we will summarize our findings in section 5.1 and then compare our findings with transcriptions from Erbaugh's (1990) study of the pear film in 5.2. In 5.3 we will discuss the pedagogical implications of this study and in 5.4 we will address the issue of aspect and our understanding of it and how to better teach this grammatical feature in Chinese. We will end by giving suggestions of what to study in the future in 5.5.

5.1 Summary of Findings

5.1.1 General Differences Between Oral and Written Narrative Discourse

After laying the groundwork for this study in Chapters One and Two, we set out in Chapter Three to examine the differences between spoken and written narrative discourse in Chinese. Narrative discourse texts proved to be an appropriate and homogenous genre of discourse to analyze. Based on Chafe's (1982) principles of integration and involvement, along with other select features pointed out by others, we examined our Chinese data against these guidelines. In addition to these guidelines we also brought out other uniquely Chinese differences that were not accounted for under Chafe's or others' theories. Because Chafe's notions were developed with conversation and formal writing in mind, they were not one hundred percent applicable to narrative discourse. Nevertheless, they remained influential and adaptable, most of the time, to our data.

For the most part, Chafe's notion of involvement was applicable to our oral narrative texts. We found that the oral texts contained characteristics of discourse where
there is a certain amount of involvement between the speaker and the listener. Even though our texts consisted primarily of monologues, the fact that there was another person present to whom the speaker narrated the events of the "pear" film, had an impact on their production of the narrative. We found that the oral narratives were replete with disfluencies so typical in oral discourse. These disfluencies consisted of false starts, self-correction, pauses, restating, repetition, and so on. The oral nature of the spoken narratives was also displayed in the fragmented structure of the I.U.'s. We found that I.U.'s in the oral narratives were generally quite short (averaging ten characters per unit) and were loosely joined together by a variety of coordinating words. These short I.U.'s were syntactically simple, generally consisting of a simple noun phrase or a verb with an accompanying noun phrase. The structure of linking many short I.U.'s together the oral narratives caused the oral narratives to be quite long (averaging 57.7 I.U.'s per narrative).

The written narratives, on the other hand, exhibited very different characteristics. They of course contained none of the so-called disfluencies that were so apparent in the oral texts. Rather, the written texts typically consisted of rather long sentences that were comprised of shorter I.U.'s (also averaging ten characters in length). These I.U.'s typically consisted of well formed, well organized, and syntactically complex sentences or phrases. Because most of the I.U.'s were also complete sentences, they tended to be longer, and contained much more information than the oral I.U.'s, and yet at the same time they were more succinct. In other words, they packed more information into each unit. Accordingly, the written narratives texts were much shorter than the oral texts, averaging just 336 characters (and 33.6 I.U.'s) per narrative.

Another aspect of the oral narratives that was brought out was the tendency of speakers to speculate or provide other evaluative comments about the narrative. This seemed to stem from the fact that there was an active listener involved in the production of the narrative. Consequently there were very few evaluative sentences in the written
narratives. As far as syntactic variation goes, we have pointed out that generally, the written narratives were more complex. This was shown in DE modification clauses as well as in the way the I.U.'s are organized and structured. We found that in the written narratives there was a nearly equal distribution of using the third-person pronoun marker and the zero anaphora. In the oral narratives there was a much greater tendency to use the third-person pronoun marking.

The Table below outlines the major differences that we discovered between these two genres of discourse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Narratives</th>
<th>Written Narratives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>long narratives</td>
<td>short narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short I.U.'s</td>
<td>long sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>narrative with many evaluative clauses</td>
<td>mostly narrative clauses, very few evaluative clauses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many coordinating words</td>
<td>few coordinating words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vernacular vocabulary</td>
<td>some literary vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syntactically simple I.U.'s</td>
<td>syntactically complex phrases/sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly 3rd person pronoun, few zero anaphora</td>
<td>equal distribution of 3rd person pronoun and zero anaphora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short, simple DE modification attributes</td>
<td>longer, more complex DE modification attributes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many of these differences are to a large extent, due to the ways in which the narratives were produced. The oral narratives were produced on-the-spot with no time for rehearsal or much forethought. The oral narratives reflected this lack of preparation time in simpler vocabulary, shorter clauses, a more disjointed organization, disfluencies, and so
on. When the informant wrote their narratives they had plenty of time to think, plan, and organize their narratives before and during the writing process. This resulted in smoother, longer, and more complex sentences in the written narratives. All these conditions and observations have been noted by Chafe (1979; 1980; 1982; 1987), Tannen (1982a; 1982b; 1982c), Horowitz and Samuels (1987) and others.

All in all, the majority of the features that have been outlined were also features found in English discourse. The one exception to this was that in written Chinese narratives, the idea units were an equal average length with the spoken discourse texts. In English, idea units in spoken discourse were significantly longer than those in the written narratives. This may suggest that in Chinese written and spoken narratives are created on an oral storytelling mode, where writers are more conscious of the reader that will process their text.

5.1.2 Aspectual Variation

In Chapter Four we analyzed the aspectual differences between oral and written narrative discourse. We not only looked at the usual aspect markers (le), but also included RVC's, verb reduplication, guo, and yōu. This gave us a broader and clearer view of the aspect system in Mandarin Chinese. Though we focused on the perfective aspect markers, we also considered the inchoative aspect marker, which we determined, based on Li, Thompson, and Thompson (1982), indicated one of the features of the perfect aspect. The reason this was included in our analysis of the viewpoint aspect, based on Smith's (1991) work, was because of its close relationship and overlapping with perfective le.

We learned that, contrary to my own expectations, RVC's were much more productive in conveying perfectivity in oral narrative discourse than any other perfective aspect marking device (nearly twice as much as perfective le). In the written narratives RVC's were just slightly more productive than perfective le. Also contrary to earlier
studies, we found that the most productive le morpheme was not the inchoative marker, as earlier studies claimed for other genres of discourse, but the perfective marker which was more than five and half times more productive in both the oral and written narratives. Le occurring post-verbally and at the end of a clause, and conveying both perfectivity and inchoativity, was the least productive use of le. Verb reduplication was a little used device for perfective marking in narrative discourse. Post-verbal guo and pre-verbal you were found to be non-existent in our narrative discourse data.

The major differences between the oral and written narratives was in productivity of aspectual marking. Aspectual marking, like other syntactic devices, was more productive in the oral narratives than in the written narratives. All aspect devices occurred a minimum of 1.5 times more in the oral narratives than in the written narratives.

The role of the perfective aspect in narration was also analyzed. We demonstrated how perfective aspect marking in Chinese gave the narrative a temporal and sequentially smooth order. This was more apparent in the oral narratives than in the written narratives. Hopper's (1979a; 1979b) claims about aspect in discourse were thus confirmed. Consequently, aspect in Chinese does appear to be a discourse function motivated by the need for an ordering in narratives.

5.2 Erbaugh's Pear Film Data

The features of oral and written narratives discussed in this study are not isolated and arbitrary. Erbaugh (1990) was part of Chafe's original project of collecting oral narratives from different language speakers all over the world. Erbaugh (1990) coordinated the collection of twenty oral narratives in Taiwan and reported her analysis in the article: "Mandarin Oral Narratives Compared with English: The Pear/Guava Stories". Her study dealt with cross-cultural comparisons of narrative structure between Chinese and English. Though the nature of her study was very different than the present one, her transcriptions
were nevertheless valuable and complementary to those of this study. Her twenty transcripts were analyzed and compared with the findings in this study.

Generally, her narratives were found to be extremely similar to those in this study, in both content and form. Her transcripts were written and arranged by "breath groups" which correspond roughly to our idea units, but not exactly. By analyzing her transcripts, "breath groups" appear to be based on pauses more than anything else. Thus, there are more breath groups in her transcripts than I.U.'s in our study. However, the total length of the narratives, in Chinese characters, was quite close to those in this study. Our oral narratives averaged 590 characters while Erbaugh's averaged 599 characters. The Table below shows the productivity averages of aspect devices used per narrative. They are compared with our own numbers. "E" indicates Erbaugh and "C" indicates Christensen.

Table 19: Erbaugh narratives vs. Christensen narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PFV  le</th>
<th>INC le</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>RVC</th>
<th>V-Redup.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers collected from Erbaugh's database are significantly close to the numbers collected in our narratives. In fact they are sufficiently close that a statistical test to check for significance is not necessary. Furthermore, because these experiments were conducted at different times and places, by different interviewers, and so forth, there are too many variables that would make a statistical test unreliable.

This confirms that the data used in our study is not only legitimate but this also confirms that our results are not random and arbitrary but can be applied to other texts of narrative oral discourse. As written narratives were not a part of Erbaugh's study this genre could not be compared.
Other aspects of our study were also observed in the Erbaugh narratives. As expected such features include oral disfluencies, temporal sequencing with perfective aspect marking, neutral aspect, short, simple clauses linked together by coordinating words, and so on, were all noted, and were very similar to our own narratives.

5.3 Pedagogical Implications

This study has provided some valuable information for the Chinese language teacher. The first thing that should be understood is that language is multi-faceted. In other words, a language exists in many different forms, or modes. In this study we have referred to these different forms as different genres of discourse. We have particularly focused on the features of spoken and written discourse. We have learned that they are different and unique, not only in their syntax and lexicon but also in the way they are created and organized. The differences between oral and written discourse is different enough that they should be treated separately.

When we teach a foreign language what kind of language are we using to teach what? Do we use written literature to teach oral communication skills? Do we use oral discourse to teach writing skills? The answers to these questions may seem obvious, but language teachers need to stop and reconsider what kind of language they are using and for what purpose.

We wish to make three points here. First, there is great value in using authentic discourse in the classroom. When we use authentic discourse texts in the classroom we are exposing our students to authentic language, the way the language is really spoken in the target country. In this way we are not limited to what a textbook says about a particular feature of the language. Another advantage of using discourse texts is that students see vocabulary and grammatical structures in an appropriate context. Too often students are required to learn things out of context. Seeing a word, phrase, or pattern in an authentic
context, that was produced by native speakers of the language will be far more valuable and remembered better than if it appeared in a textbook in a limited context with a lengthy explanation. As authentic discourse is sometimes difficult to process and understand for beginners, it may be best to introduce this kind of information at the intermediate level. Though some shorter and simpler discourse texts can be used successfully at the beginning level.

Second, it is important to use both oral and written discourse texts. As we have explained above, written language is quite different from spoken language. What about the argument that we want people to speak properly. I think what we really want is not for our learners to speak "properly" per se, but rather to speak like a native of the target language, however that may be. People do not speak their native language the way it is typically outlined in a textbook. If they did, they would sound like aliens, and would probably cause a great deal of smirking and suppressed laughter from native eavesdroppers. By studying both oral and written discourse texts we can only then truly understand the language in its appropriate contexts. The person who learned a foreign language by reading books always sounds bookish, proper, and out of place. A wide variety of discourse texts can be used successfully in the classroom. For oral discourse one can use recordings of informal conversations, radio and television shows, news broadcasts, speeches, and so on. For written discourse one can select newspaper and magazine articles, literature, essays, poetry, and so forth. By using both modes of discourse, learners can get a broader picture of the language and learn which strategies are used for speaking and which are used for writing.

Third, use the appropriate discourse genre for the skills to be learned. This may sound obvious, but many classes of the old grammar-translation school still use literature or other forms of written discourse to teach the spoken language. To teach oral communication skills, it is important to use audio or video recordings of native participants
performing those skills. As learners see and hear how natives react and respond in different situations they have ideal models to imitate. Since speaking a foreign language is nothing more than performing it is important that learners have accurate and authentic models to imitate. Oral discourse texts provide these models.

On the written side, if one wants to teach students how to write letters in the second language, what better way than to study and read letters written by natives in their native language. Likewise, if we want our learners to be able to read literary works then we naturally use literary writings in the classroom. By using the specific genre of discourse we want our students to learn, we greatly increase their chances of learning those skills correctly, effectively, and in the proper context.

5.4 The Understanding and Teaching of Aspect

In this section we will discuss how aspect is perceived and taught in elementary Chinese textbooks. The textbooks used in this analysis are DeFrancis' *Beginning Chinese*, and Beijing Foreign Languages Institute's *Practical Chinese Reader*. These two books were selected primarily because they are probably the two most widely used Chinese language textbooks used in this country. In our discussion we will point out how aspect is taught in these textbooks and discuss their strengths and deficiencies. Finally, we will propose a way to teach aspect more effectively.

Most Chinese language textbooks introduce grammatical features, such as aspect marking, as they occur in the selected dialogues learned by learners. There is usually no systematic approach to teaching a certain grammatical principle in all its contexts. This is not a bad approach in that overburdening learners with contexts that they are not yet familiar with will only confuse and discourage them. Ideally through their course of study they eventually learn a particular grammatical principle fully, with all its contexts and shades of meaning. In *Practical Chinese Reader* (hereafter PCR), perfective 例 is
introduced in Lesson Twenty-seven, and sentence-final le, which they regard as a mood particle, is introduced in Lesson Twenty-eight. RVC's and verb reduplication are not introduced in volume one. In *Beginning Chinese* (hereafter BC), the morpheme le (DeFrancis makes no distinction between the two le's), are introduced in Lesson Thirteen, and RVC's are introduced in Lesson Fourteen.

DeFrancis makes no distinction between the two le morphemes. In his explanation there is just one le that can occur either post-verbally as a suffix, or at the end of a clause or sentence. He does a fair job of showing the various different uses of the le's with many sample sentences, but his explanations are rather sparse. From my own experience with this textbook, most students have a difficult time, not only understanding how le functions, but also in understanding what aspect is, its function, and how it differs from and/or relates to tense (which most American students are familiar with).

PCR does a little better job of explaining aspect, even hinting at the difference between aspect and tense, but still falls short of an adequate explanation. In speaking with colleagues who have used PCR, their observations are very similar to my own regarding BC. After this limited exposure to aspect (usually about one years worth of instruction), most students still cannot use le effectively and correctly. Oftentimes, they simply use it as a past tense marker which may work part of the time, but will get them into trouble much of the time.

It is assumed that teachers supplement these textbooks with more detailed explanations of aspect and how it works. Even so, it seems that many students fail to grasp its meaning and continue to struggle with this grammatical feature for years. In this study we have attempted to emphasize the great importance of the viewpoint aspect, particularly perfective aspect in Chinese discourse, and even more importantly in narrative discourse. In that narrative discourse is such an important part of communication (i.e. telling stories, relating past events), a sound understanding of the aspect system is essential early in the
learners language learning career. This understanding must also go beyond the boundaries of a simple discussion of the le morphemes.

Some important features of aspect that are completely left out of both of these textbooks, and which should be included in a discussion of aspect, is a treatment of the zero aspect, and the use of RVC's and verb reduplication to indicate perfective aspect.

The very fact that aspectual marking is optional in Chinese is not mentioned in either BC or PCR, or many other textbooks for that matter. This can be very confusing to students when they see a verb without a perfective marker which indicates completed action according to the context. When they do not know that aspect marking is optional they are getting mixed messages which lead to confusion and frustration. For these obvious reasons it is important that when teachers and textbook writers explain aspect they also include in that discussion the possibility of the zero aspect.

In this study we pointed out that using RVC's was by far the most productive way to convey perfective aspect in narrative discourse, especially in oral narratives. For this reason it is equally important to point this fact out when discussing the aspect system. Students stand a better chance of really understanding the aspect system if they are gradually exposed to all the various ways that aspect can be expressed, especially those ways that are most productive and actively used by native speakers, like RVC's. Students also will have a greater advantage of understanding aspect if teachers use examples from authentic discourse in their explanations. This will allow learners to observe how it is used in a contextually accurate and realistic situation.

5.5 Where do we go from here?

This study has been valuable in that we have learned that written discourse is substantially different than spoken discourse in Mandarin Chinese. We have also gained a greater understanding of the aspect system in Chinese. Inasmuch as I tried to include all
forms of aspect in this study there are yet other features in Chinese grammar that seem to indicate an aspectual meaning. For example, the sentence final use of *de* as in the *shi...de* construction seems also to indicate perfectivity. It would be worthwhile to investigate this and other features that may have some relationship to the aspect system in Mandarin.

In that this study was limited to narrative discourse, it would be valuable to branch out and observe other genres of discourse as well. The more genres and contexts (written and spoken) of a language that we analyze, the better we will be able to understand the language as a whole. In this regard, the notion of sentence, idea unit, and intonation unit could use a more thorough analysis. In this study we defined an idea unit by three criteria, syntax, intonation, and pausing. Admittedly, it was sometimes difficult to decide what the relationship was between syntax and phonology and which was the motivating factor in distinguishing idea units. In that Tao's (1993) dissertation deals with conversation and this study with narration, there were differences in the interpretation of discourse units. The overlapping of syntax and phonology in the creation of discourse units would make a valuable study.

There is already a considerable amount of research concerning the Chinese language based on structural and formal approaches. As we see more and more studies based on a more discourse-based functional approach, we are beginning to understand the language better, and in the process becoming better equipped to teach it to others.

As far as the aspect system in Chinese goes, we have made progress in this study. We have discussed the important role that aspect plays in narratives. This is especially important to understand in that telling stories is an integral part of everyday life. We have also analyzed the viewpoint aspect, particularly the perfective aspect, looking at all the various ways of indicating perfectivity, and how each is used. This has seldom been done in previous studies. Not only that, but we have used the "living" language the way it is actually used by natives speakers to explain, demonstrate, and describe perfectivity in
Mandarin Chinese. In a sense we have provided a pedagogical description of the perfective aspect in narrative discourse. It is hoped that it is beneficial to scholars and learners of the Chinese language.

Finally, the complete transcriptions of the oral and written narratives in Chinese characters,(in the Appendices), provide the full context for all the examples and explanations that were used throughout this study. These transcriptions alone can serve as a rich resource for future studies in dozens of different areas of discourse analysis, from grammatical analyses to more cognitive-based studies, such as the studies originally conducted on the pear stories.
APPENDIX A
ORAL NARRATIVE TRANSCRIPTS

ORAL NARRATIVE A

答： 这个故事是说有一位果树林的工人在那里摘梨子
用梯子爬到树上去摘梨子
摘了很多梨以后放到筐子里边
然后过一会有一个小男孩
我想大概是他的儿子吧
骑着自行车
骑着自行车
来到那个他的果木场
然后把装好的梨子放到自行车的自行车的前面
然后他就骑上自行车
大概送到他们仓库去
或者什么地方去
他先是骑在自行车上
后来在路上
从路的另一边有一个女孩骑自行车过来
他们刚刚他们互相错过以后
他因为分散了一下注意力吧
所以没有注意前面一块石头
就，自行车撞到一块石头上
就摔倒了
摔倒了以后所有的梨都都都掉到地上去了
这时候从小路上来了有好几个，有几个孩子
他们
我想有两个男孩，一个女孩吧
他们看到他的自行车倒了
梨子摔下去了
摔掉了
他们就过去，七手八脚地帮他把梨子装好
然后帮他重新装到自行车上面
这个时候他就没再骑了
他就开始推着走
然后这几个小孩也继续走
走他们的路吧
过一会这个其中有一个男孩发现他的小草帽
掉在那儿了
掉在边上了
他没注意
然后他打了个口哨，就告诉他
他的帽子掉了
然后他拾起了帽子，就走回去送到她的
因为他是推自行车不方便吧
送到她的面前
他为了表示感谢就给了几个这个梨给这个男孩，三个梨
然后这个男孩就拿着梨送给小孩一个人一个
他们就往前走
他们走过那个果木场
摘梨的那位中年人，看见他们手上拿着梨走过去了
好像有点
咦，他们怎么拿着我的梨的喔
带着疑问
目送着他们走过去
完了
ORAL NARRATIVE B

答：OK, 一个男人在采梨子

采，采，采

然后一个小女孩，把采好的梨子放到一个篮子里面

骑着脚踏车骑走了

在骑的过程中他看到一个女孩子

小女孩很可爱

所以他转头看

结果他的脚踏车碰到一个石头

他跌倒了

梨子撒在全部的

满在地上

三个小男孩

忽然间，三个小男孩在树的旁边跑出来

帮了这个小孩子，把梨子拿起来

这个小孩

那个开梨子脚踏车的那个小孩

在梨掉下去的时候，他的帽子也掉了

这帽子掉到远一点的地方

那三个小孩跑出来帮他捡梨子

以后，他就

他们就他们就走了

捡完后，他就要走了

就走，他们两分钟以后，三个孩子把那个帽子捡回来

还给那个另外一个骑脚踏车的小孩子
骑脚踏车的小孩子，给他三个梨子
就这样说走了
这三个小孩子带著梨子走走走
结果回到那个树旁边那个男人的地方
这个男人
在他们走，走以前那个男的回头看
往下看
他一个篮子的梨子全不见了
他又觉得莫名其妙
为什么全不见了
结果他看到这三个小孩过来
一个
有两个把梨子放在手上
他一直瞪着他
那就走走走走
结束了
ORAL NARRATIVE C

答：讲就是一个农夫很辛苦

摘那些东西

很难

很久了才摘到一篮水果

那小孩子将它偷了

而且他跌倒了

几个小孩子帮助他

他就很好心地拿几粒拿几粒梨子送给那小孩子

结果那小孩子经过那棵梨子树的时候

梨树那些，那个农夫那个农夫走过

以为他，他，他。

我想他大概认为这几个小孩子偷了他的水果

可是小孩子认为说，这是他得来的

他帮助人家

人家给他的

答：就是那农夫

他也，不太可能

就是说，人家偷你的东西不晓得

而且那小孩骑脚踏车过来

他应该有听到

有声音

因为人家牵个牛过去他都知所有他的损失可以说是他自己的损失

因为你知道有人经过的话

你去上面，你应该看一下

没有，就这样被人家偷了一整篮的
那你卖水果为生的
一整篮是很多的水果
就这样
答：那三个小孩是好心啊
看起来那三个小孩子们是怕怕
因为他好心帮另外一个小孩子
偷了水果那小孩子，跌倒了的时候，他们也没有马上去帮他，就这样看一看
到最后帮他扶起来
帮他捡了一大堆水果
就这样
这故事，这tape也是有点奇怪
因为这小孩子而已
这么大篮的水果，他能够放在脚踏车前面这样骑着没事
就撞了石头才跌倒的
太，有点不可思议
因为他们年纪小小的
他也不可能提起这么重的篮子
而且他提起来的时候，就把它放在前面那里
一手骑脚踏车，觉得
impossible
答：据我所记忆，就是有一个人
他在摘梨子吧
他很卖力地摘
天气看起来好像蛮热的
他就是爬在树上，把摘好的暂时先放在他身上的兜兜
然后再收集到篓子里面
然后地上已经装满了二三篓
然后我就看到一个小孩子
看到那位
那位摘梨子的不注意
爬在树上不注意的时候把他的梨子就用脚踏车载走了
结果载呀
载呀
载，载到半路
刚好跟一个小女孩骑着骑着脚踏车
擦身而过
不小心就翻倒了
好
然后我就看到有三位其他的小孩子，过来帮忙他
把那些梨筐搬回去
后来他们也顺便一人拿一粒，边走边吃
然后往回头路上走，就经过原先摘梨子的那一位先生旁边
那位先生一下来，发觉他的梨子少了
看到三个小孩子正在吃着他的梨子
大概我在猜他以为说被那三个顽皮的小孩给吃了
就是这样子
答：那个电影呀
好像是一个收获的季节
一个墨西哥的
一个
一个季节工
在那儿采那个
在树上
采梨子
呃......然后呢
他就一个个采了，就往筐里放
然后再踩着梯子到踩着梯子到
树上去采
采了以后嘛
然后放下来
就有一个小孩就
这个好像是早上
因为好像开始的时候听见有鸡叫
但是那个实际上看起来又不像是清早
可能就是早上十点钟左右
十点钟左右怎么会鸡叫呢
有点奇怪
然后有个小孩骑个自行车就过来看见他采梨
开始我还以为那小孩子是他儿子
来帮他把梨拿回去
可是又有点不太像
也许是小孩来偷梨的
不知道是偷梨还是怎么样
还是，还是来帮他干活的
那么
还有一个农民
另外一个人就牵着一只羊过来
大概是放羊的
后来这小孩拿了一筐梨就往自行车的前头放
放到自行车前头
这个人居然也没注意到这小孩过来
后来小孩骑车
骑着车嘛
正好那边又来了一个女的也骑着一辆车
可能那个女的也是来帮忙的吧
帮他运梨的
然后这小孩就注意看那女的呢
自己不小心就撞到一块石头上了
就，自行车就翻车
然后所有的梨
一筐梨都给搬到地上了
那么小孩好像膝盖
腿的膝盖也给摔坏了
坐在那里有点好像不愿意站起来的样子
然后旁边又来了三个小孩
那三个小孩是在玩的
就下来帮他
帮他把梨都捡到筐子里面去
然后又这个
帮他把筐子放到自行车上
这小孩呢就只好推着车走了
因为他腿已经摔坏了
不能骑了
走了一段呢
那个三个玩的小孩，其中一个大一点的一个就发觉他的
这个小孩的一顶帽子掉了
然后又把帽子给他捡回去
就送给他
这小孩好像还是挺感谢他们的
就拿了三个梨给他们
表示感谢
然后就带着帽子走了
就完了
答：好
是尽可能详细吧
ok. 呗
一开始我们看见是
摵......有一个中年男子站在梯子上面，在摘梨
后来他穿一件白的
有一个肚兜的围裙似的衣服
是专门用来摘
摘水果的
他摘完了一兜就从梯子上面下来
把那个兜里面的梨子倒进树下面他放着的那个筐子里面
那里边一共有三个筐子
等我们，我们第一次看见他下来的时候呢
一个筐子呢已经装满了
他倒完了以后又重新从梯子上面
重新回到梯子上面再去摘梨
摵......这个时候我们看见有一个小伙子牵着一头羊走过
从树下走过
走过
然后我们看见有一个大概是八九岁或十岁的男孩子骑了一辆自行车
从梨树下面路过
摵......他看见了地上的两个筐
就把车子停下来
把车子轻轻地放到地上
放倒在地上
呃……一开始他想拿一个梨
但后来他改变了主意
就端了一满筐梨
趁着那个摘梨的人不注意的时候，就把那个梨子放在他那个自行车
前面的那个载物架上面
就骑着走了
呃……这个时候那个摘梨的并没有发觉一筐梨已经被他搬走了
呃……那个小男孩骑着车
在一条狭路上骑过去的时候
对面来了一个女孩
也是骑一个自行车在一条很窄的路上面
相对交会
交会的时候，那个女孩子就不小心带飞了那个男孩子的一顶草帽
这个就分了这个男孩子的心
结果他那个自行车就撞在路面上一块大石头上
车倒下来
梨就撒了一地
然后，我们看见这个男孩子爬起来
这个时候从对面又来了另外有三个男孩子
个大一些
有一个小一些
他们看见这个情况就来帮他
帮这个男孩子把撒在地上的梨子捡起来
放回筐子里面
又帮他把自行车扶起来
他们把筐子抬到自行车上面
然后那个男孩子就推着车子走了
这里三个男孩子继续走他们的路
然后，呃
有一个就看见刚才那个男孩掉在地上的那顶草帽
他捡起来以后就认为这顶草帽应该是那个骑车的男孩的
所以他吹了一声口哨
呃.....打个招呼给那个男孩
那个男孩停下来
呃.....然后这个捡了帽子的男孩就走过去把草帽还给他
呃......然后那个呢
骑自行车的男孩就拿了三个梨，送给这个男孩子
然后他们又分手了
这个男孩子把三个梨拿回来给了另外两个孩子一人一个
他们一边吃梨，一边走他们的路
当他们走过那个梨树下面的时候
正是那摘梨的人从树，树，树上
从梯子上面下来
这个时候他发现有筐梨已经不见了
他看到这些男孩子咬着梨从树下走过
呃....他觉得很很怀疑
他怀疑这些男孩子把他那筐梨搬走了
答：一开始就是有一个有一个
果农在摘梨子
后来他摘了一兜以后
他就要放到三个篮子里面
有三个大的篮子
两个已经装了很多了
还有一个看起来是空的
所以他装的时候
掉到草上
他捡起来
然后他把围巾拿下来擦一擦
擦干净以后又放回去
放好了以后，他就又上树上去摘梨子
呃，这个时候我们就听到羊的叫声
然后就有一个放羊的人牵着一只羊走过来
往树的右边走过去了
然后，这个时候从右边又有一个小男孩骑脚踏车过来
呃，小男孩，经过这个树下三个篮子三个篮子
中间，他就
本来想偷一个梨子
然后看一看那个树上摘的人很专心
他就干脆把整筐梨子放在他的脚踏车上
然后他就骑走了
骑
然后他向左边骑走
骑了没有好远，又有一个小女孩骑着脚踏车
迎面骑过来
然后这个小男孩回头望那个小女孩
正好有风把他的帽子吹掉了
然后又因为他回头看小孩，没有，没有注意前面有一块石头
所以前轮碰到石头
车子就翻了
那个梨子撒到地上
撒到地上
呃，他就
他正有一点点不知所措
结果前面有人吹口哨
他抬头一看
三个小男孩
比他大一点可能
在树荫下面
前面树荫下面，有一个在玩板球
然后他们就慢慢走过来
然后开始帮他把梨子捡起来放到篓子里面
然后把篓子帮他放到
又把他扶起来放到篓子上
然后这个小男孩就骑车走了
刚刚走没有两步
这三个小男孩
帮他忙的小男孩
就往右边这个方向走，就往果树
那个梨子树那边走
没有走两步就看到地上他掉的帽子
然后其中有一个就把那个帽子捡起来
然后他们就吹口哨，把那个小男孩
又好像把他叫住了
然后那小男孩停了自行车, 回头看了一眼
然后那三个，好像是玩板球的，那个小孩就把那个帽子拿过去
送给那个小男孩
然后那个小男孩就从他的
那个，那篓梨子里面拿了三个给他
好像谢谢他的意思
然后这个小男孩就拿了那三个梨子过来
骑脚踏车的小男孩就骑着车，带着那一篓梨子走了
然后这个小男孩回来以后就把三个梨子
他们三个人，一人分了一个，就一路吃一路往那个梨子树那边走
走了没有
正好这个时候
我们就看到那个果农下树来
他又摘了一篓
一兜的梨子要放到篓子里
结果他一下子看，少了一篓梨子
然后，他就有点莫名其妙
正好这个时候，这三个小男孩走过来
每一个人手里拿了一个梨子在啃
所以他
呃，但是这三个小男孩也不知道，也没有停
就看了他一眼
然后就走过去了
然后，就到这完
答：越详细越好

就是刚开始的时候

是刚开始的时候就是一个果农他在摘果子

是好像是八乐或者是梨子

应该是八乐吧

然后他就摘八乐，一面摘一面摘

其实速度很慢

那个电影速度很慢

他摘了八乐把它放在篮子里

放在篮子里以后

他再上去摘

摘八乐

然后有一个人牵了一只羊过来了

羊叫着

然后那个人就走过去而已

然后镜头还是回到那个果农

那个果农有点老

大概四、五十岁

然后他的儿子过来了

刚开始他的儿子是骑着脚踏车过来的

刚开始，他看到一篮子水果

他想吃一个

然后看看他的爸爸

他还是不要吃吧

可是我想他很想吃
然后他没有吃
他克制自己没吃
然后就把篮子的水果放在脚踏车上
然后就骑，骑，骑

蛮重的
可是他可以坐得很好
然后骑，骑，骑
结果骑，迎面来了一个漂亮的小妞

喔，他就看她一眼
可是那女孩子没有看他一眼
然后他就看她一眼
结果路上有个石头
然后不小心
他就跌倒了
那整个果子整个水果都掉到地上
然后他就觉得有点痛
然后他就拍他的脚
然后有三个
可能是他的朋友
但是他们没有说任何的话
三个小孩子看到他跌倒了
然后，刚开始，我以为他们是找碴的
因为看到漂亮的小姐过去了
漂亮的小女孩过去了
然后他跌倒了
刚开始以为他
他们会找他的碴
可是没有
那三个小孩子就帮忙他
帮他收拾那些水果
然后把它放好
放到篮子里
然后他们也没说任何话
然后就走了
走了以后，有一个
其中有一个小男生
他一直玩着那个，那个板子
好像是乒乓球拍子
一直玩，一直玩，
然后他看到呃
这好像是那个小男孩的帽子
然后他就叫他
不是叫，他用口哨
他吹了一声口哨
然后那个男孩子知道他在呼唤他
然后他就
那个拿乒乓板的小孩就把帽子拿给他
然后跌倒的那个孩子
他觉得，他们对他很好
他想感谢他们，所以就给他们三粒果子
然后那个乒乓拍的孩子就回去了
一个人，每一个人一粒果子
好，然后，镜头又回到那个果农
那个老先生
然后那三个小孩子就走走走走走走
走过来
然后那个果农下来了
他刚开始是爬在树上摘果子
然后他下来了
他下来
咦，怎么奇怪
怎么少了一个篮子
这个时候刚好那三个孩子一面吃着果子，一面走过来
然后那个果农就觉得很奇怪
怎么会少了一篮果子
然后他们正在吃我摘的果子
所以我不知道那个果农是怀疑他们拿他的
还是说他只是在觉得好奇怪
怎么会一下子变成这样子
事情就这样子
就完了
答：哎呀，我已经全部忘记了

OK，有一个老鹰，在摘梨子
当然也是一种软了巴几的梨子
不是中国人经常吃的那种
似乎这个人脑子有点毛病
他这个不论是摘的动作
还是从梯子上爬下来
还是从兜里往外拿梨子
这些动作都非常慢
而且那个样子很笨哪
从兜里往外掏梨子掏了半天
而不是像你像的，把那个放到筐子上面
把兜反过来就可以了
袋子
后来呢
他摘了一会
后来有个人牵了一只羊从他面前走过
一只山羊
后来过来一个小孩，骑着自行车
这个
他看他没注意就想拿一个
这个他摘的水果
也不知道是什么
后来看他实在没有一点要往下看的意思，就决定拿一筐
把它放到自行车的前头
他偷完了这个水果，骑了一会
前面有个和他年龄差不多的女孩
和他相反的方向骑
他就朝她看看
就在这时候风一吹，把他帽子给吹跑了
头发也把它，头发吹下来
反正他又在往后看
同时呢，那个风把头发吹下来把眼睛遮住了
他就没看见车就撞到一块石头上
就摔倒了
他坐在地上，拍拍身上的土
这时候，正好边上有一个另外的小孩
就过来帮他把水果都拾起来放到筐子里
他就重新上路
他们就朝相反的方向走
他呢
就朝他的原来骑的方向走
后来那几个小孩走几步看到他掉在地上的帽子
就跟他吹口哨说
帽子
他就回来拿了帽子
他没回来拿帽子
那个其中有一个小孩
就是有一个小孩拿着一个乒乓球拍的东西
老是在玩，就那个小孩
他在就把帽子捡起来
走过去送给那个骑车的小孩
那个骑车的小孩就送给他们三个
三个那个水果
他就呢后来跟他们分吃了
答：可以。这是一个果实丰收的季节

呢......有一个老板正在他自己的院子里摘梨

然后，小心翼翼地摘了

他，摘梨

然他发现有一个梨子掉到地上了

他就给它捡起来

然后解下他的scarf，就给它擦擦干净

再轻轻地放到筐里

然后他又回去摘他的梨

有两筐

他这时已经满了两筐梨

远处有一位骑自行车的小男孩，慢慢地过来

过来。看到摘梨的人在没有注意他

他就快速地把他车子放下

然后呢把那一大筐梨放到自己的车上

就走了

骑车就走了

摘梨的人仍然在摘他的梨

他也没有发觉那个小孩已经把他的梨带走了

然后，那个骑车的人

他看到远处有一辆自行车跟他面对面走过来

就慌了

然后呢就撞到那块石头上

自己呢连车带梨全翻下来
把脚也痛痛了
正好他要捡梨的时候呢，他在揉自己的脚的时间过来三个小男孩
然后他就帮他们捡梨
然后把地上的梨全捡起来
然后呢小孩揉揉脚上的那个
把痛的地方揉一下
然后呢他就继续走他的路
三个小男孩也走他的路
这三个小男孩他们看见地上有一顶他的草帽
然后又把他叫住
就把草帽还给他
这时这个骑车的男孩子
骑车的，他就拿了三个梨给他们
因为天气也非常热，他就把三个梨给他们
然后三个男孩就啃着梨，就走了
当他们路过那个摘梨的人那个地方
摘梨的人
这时摘梨的人下来发现他的两筐梨少了一筐
他心里就很纳闷
这时他看见三个男孩大摇大摆地过来
手上啃着梨
他就在想，是不是他的梨
他想这个梨怎么跟他的梨是一样的
故事发生在一个果园。一个中年男子用一个木梯爬到树上去摘梨子。先把摘下的梨放进一个口袋。然后把梨放进一个大筐中。这时，一个男孩，大约是他的儿子。骑着自行车来到果园。他把一筐梨放在他的自行车，然后骑上自行车。大约是运往一个仓库。他骑着自行车。这时一个女孩骑着车从他对面过来，分散了他的注意力，他们错过以后。他没注意到路上有一个石头。车撞到石头上，他摔倒了。梨撒满一地。这时从树荫下走出来三个孩子，两个男孩，一个女孩。他们看到这种情况，就上来帮助他把梨子重新装回筐子。于是他继续推着车子向村子走去。这时一个男孩发现他的草帽掉在地上。就打了一个口哨告诉他，并把草帽送到他手上。为了表示感谢。他送给男孩三个梨子。男孩收下，分给大家一人一个。他们继续向前走去。他们走到那个中年男子摘梨的地方。中年男子略带惊讶与怀疑的眼神。目送他们远去。
一个男人在捡梨子。捡了两篮的梨子。一个小男孩骑脚踏车，拿了一篮的梨子。在路上看到一个可爱的小女孩。小男孩回头一看，碰到一个石头，跌倒了。忽然间，三个小男孩出现帮助他。扶他起来，帮他捡梨子。捡帽子。然后走了。回到大男人捡梨子。他发觉两篮间的一个篮子不见了。这一回儿，三个小男孩走他旁边。其中两个男孩在吃梨子。大男人觉得莫名其妙。
一个农夫(采梨的)，很辛苦的采了一筐筐的梨子。不久之后被一个骑脚踏车的小孩偷了。那个小孩不小心被石头绊到。(因为看着另一个骑脚踏车的女孩。)刚好有三个男孩经过。那三个男孩子看了一眼，便帮助他，扶他起来。还帮他捡起一筐子的梨子。弄好了之后便要离开。但他们看见了他的帽子，就替他捡了起来，还给了那个男孩。那男孩便好心的送给他们一个各一粒梨子。这三位男孩子继续走，经过了那位农夫。那农夫很好奇的看他们三位男孩子手中的梨，他还以为是那三位男孩子偷了他的一整筐的梨。而用很惊讶的眼光看他们。
有一个人在大热天爬在树上摘梨子。他把摘好的收集在地上的篮子内。有一小孩，趁他不注意时偷了一篮用脚踏车载走。那偷梨小孩于路上不巧和另一骑车小女孩撞倒地梨子散落到地上。旁观的有另三个小孩帮他收好梨子。临走时每一个小孩各拿了一个梨子边走边吃往那摘梨子先生方向走去。正当这三个小孩经过那摘梨先生时，他下树发现他的梨子少了一篮。所以他就误会是这三个小孩偷梨子。
收果果的季节，一个墨西哥季节工在果园里采果。他用梯子搭在树上，爬上去把果一个一个摘下来放到筐里。这个工人干活不紧不慢，但仍然出了一头汗。显然他干得并不十分轻松，看来原因是他太胖了一点。

这时正是上午，远处听见鸡叫，一个农人牵着一头山羊过来吃草。小路上一个男孩骑着一辆自行车过来。他在梯旁停下，帮季节工把采好的果放到自行车上运走。一筐果看不重，小男孩一下子就提起来放到自行车龙头前面的架子上了。

在路上一个妇女也骑着一辆自行车过来。她的架子在自行车后面而不是前面。小男孩觉得好奇，只顾看，撞上了一块大石头，车子摔了，果也撒了一地。他的膝盖也跌破了。

这时过来三个在路旁玩耍的小孩。他们帮着摘起地上的果把筐子放回自行车上。现在小男孩只能推着车走，他的腿摔疼了，不能骑车了。

才推了几步，最大的那个小孩发现小男孩的草帽摔交时掉在地上忘了捡起来。他捡起草帽去还给小男孩。小男孩很感谢这三个帮助他的不相识的朋友，就从筐子里拿了三个果给他们。

三个小孩一边吃着果一边朝前走。经过了果园，季节工正好站在梯子旁休息，看着这三个无忧无虑的小孩吃着果走过去。
在电影中我们看到一个中年男子站在一架梯子上摘梨子。他穿着一件胸前有
两个大口袋的围裙，摘下来的梨子就放在那大口袋里。装满了一口，他就从梯子
下来，走到树下的箩筐旁，把口袋里的梨子倒进去。这时他已经装满了一只筐
里的两只了。然后他又重新回到梯子上去摘梨子。这时有一个大约八、九岁左右的
小男孩骑着一辆自行车路过树下，见了满筐的梨子，男孩就停下来。轻轻地放倒自
行车。当他看清了摘梨人没注意他时，就拿了一个梨。但他马上又改变了主意，
腌起一满筐梨放在自行车前面的载物架上，然后骑着车子走了。一会儿对面有一个
十一、十二岁的女孩骑车而来，两车交会时，女孩无意中带飞了男孩的草帽。但她
没有发现这事，顾自己骑车走了。男孩因为帽子被带飞，精神一直不集中，前轮撞
在一块大石头上。人和车全倒在地上，梨子撒了满地都是。这时从对面来了三个路
过的男孩，见了这情况，就上来帮忙，他们把梨子全捡起来放回筐子里。扶起自行
车，便这个男孩可以推着车子走。等他们和这男孩分手后，其中最大的男孩又发现
了掉在地上的帽子。他捡起了帽子，朝推自行车的男孩吹了一声口哨。那孩子听到
口哨就停了下来，这个大男孩就走回去把帽子还给他。为了表示他的谢意，那个推
自行车的男孩就送给他们三个梨。但是当这三个男孩咬着梨从梨树下经过时，正是
摘梨人从梯子上下来发现一筐梨不见了的时候。他看着这三个男孩走过去，眼中浮
现出一股怀疑和迷惑。
刚开始一个果农在摘梨子。树下有三个大篮子，他摘完后放在其中一个篮子里。有一枚掉到地上。他捡起来把脖子上的红围巾拿出来擦了擦放到篮子里，之后又回到树上去摘。有一个牧人牵了一只羊经过树下。又有一个小女孩骑了一辆脚踏车从另一个方向过来。经过树下看到篮子里的梨子。本想顺手拿一个。看看摘梨子的人在树上专心摘梨子没注意，空性把一篮都提起来放到车中骑走了。

骑了没多远，对面又有一个小女孩也骑着脚踏车来。两人交会后小男孩仍回头望着小女孩。风把他的帽子吹掉了。正好车子的前轮又碰到一块大石头。车倒人翻梨子也撒了一地。小男孩正不知所措，前面树荫下有三个男孩走过来开始帮他拾梨子，扶车。还把那篮梨子帮他放到车上。

小男孩上车骑了没多远。反向走去的那三个男孩正好走到他帽子落地处，有一个小男孩捡起帽子回头向骑车的小孩吹了吹口哨。小孩停车回头。拾帽子的小孩趁前把帽子还给他。他也从篮子里拿了三枚梨子答谢还帽子的小孩。小孩回到同伴处一人给了枚，他们三人便一边吃梨子一边向前走去。

这时摘梨子的人又从树上下来把兜里的梨子放到篮子里。忽然发现少了一篮。正好那三个小男孩也走到树下，一人手里拿了一枚梨子。边吃边走了过去。

摘梨子的人有些莫名其妙。
WRITTEN NARRATIVE H

镜头出现一个果农在摘芭乐（or梨子）。他是一个中年果农。摘果子时他先放在大衣袋里。然后放进篮子里。一会儿，有个人牵着一只羊走过来。没说任何话。果农继续摘果子。不久，他的儿子骑着脚踏车过来。小孩子想尝一口果子，但是他犹豫着拿或是不拿。后来他并没有拿。他将整个篓子的果子搬上脚踏车带回家去。在回家的路上，没想到迎面来了他的梦中情人——漂亮小女孩。小男孩直盯着她看忘了前头有块石头，他撞到了石头，倒了地。果子也撒了一地。小男孩虽然跌倒了，但是他并不埋怨，只是拍拍灰尘，摸摸腿儿。准备起身，收拾果子，抬头一看，有三个孩子在他看他。那三个小孩帮他收拾果子。到了，他们彼此并未说任何话就要走，突然三个小孩之中一个那球拍的男孩看到地上一顶帽子。他想应该是那小男孩的，所以他吹着口哨叫住他。迎面把帽子给了那个小男孩。小男孩心存感激，送了三个果子予这位拿乒乓拍的男孩作为酬谢。拿乒乓拍的男孩将果子分送给其他二位男孩。三个小孩就一迭边吃果子边走向果园。这时老果农已摘好果子，下了阶梯。一看怎么少了一篓果子，刚好迎面走来了这三个吃着果子的男孩。果农正在奇怪是谁拿走了果子。他忘记有几篓果子。他怀疑着没说任何话就看着三个小男孩走了过去。
老墨摘一种什么梨。动作神态愚笨无比。另有行人牵羊过路，平淡无奇。
后来，有一少年骑单车出场，无忧虑，狡猾可喜。少年来到前景，发现地上的
梨，少年手按一只梨，举头视察动静，胆大心细。见老墨憨厚神态，毫无捉贼的机
敏，便放下车来，把一筐梨都捡了去。
少年途人带梨骑出去不远便碰见一年龄相仿的女孩迎面骑车过来。少年窥视,
一不留神风吹来，帽落地。少年更加回头，不见轮前一块石头。车撞顽石，少年
复翻在地，筐中梨子大多流了一地。路边三个男小子见此情景过来帮助少年拾梨。
拾梨毕，一小子搬走顽石于路边。少年上车，各自上路。不出几步，一小子发现
路边少年的帽子，口哨示意，回头赶上少年还帽，少年回赠三只梨。
三个小子食梨于老墨摘梨树下路过，正值老墨数梨。老墨发现少了一筐梨，
视三小子大嚼纳闷不已。
这是一个果实收获的季节。有一个人正在树上摘梨。每装满一布袋，他就下来
将梨小心翼翼地放进竹篮里。不小心，有一只梨掉到地上，他就将梨捡起来，解下
他的围巾，轻轻地将梨擦干净，放进篮里。然后又重新爬上树，继续摘梨。有一个
十四，五岁男孩子，骑着自行车由远而近，来到梨树下。当他看见摘梨的人并没有
发现他时，他就迅速地放下车子，将梨装上车，匆匆忙忙地跑了。在路上，骑车的
人对面又来了另外一辆自行车，因为紧张，匆忙，他连梨带人倒在了路上。正好，又
有三个男孩子，他们帮助骑车的人将梨捡起来，放进篮里。骑车的人走了，三个男
孩子发现了骑车人的草帽还在路上。其中有一个男孩子捡起帽子，将它送给骑车人
的手中。这时，骑车的男孩子从篮里拿出三个梨，送给帮助他的男孩子们。骑车的
人走了，三个男孩子边走边吃着梨。摘梨人从树上下来，发现少了一篮梨，又见到
三个男孩子边走边吃着梨经过。摘梨人在想，是谁拿了他的一篮梨呢？
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